

34-  
8-2-  
1925  
S. H. Boyd  
W. H. Wannamaker  
THE

THE

# South Atlantic Quarterly

WILLIAM K. BOYD,  
WILLIAM H. WANNAMAKER, } EDITORS

Volume XXIV

---

DURHAM, NORTH CAROLINA

1925

9

10773  
10113  
10113

THE NEW YORK  
PUBLIC LIBRARY

254957A  
ASTOR, LENOX AND  
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS  
R 1926 L

# Contents of Volume XXIV

## NUMBER 1, JANUARY 1925

The Railroad Labor Board: An Appraisal <i>Clyde Olin Fisher</i> .....	1
The Amenities of an English Election <i>William Thomas Morgan</i> .....	16
Jane Austen's "Love and Freindship": A Study in Literary Relations..... <i>Annette B. Hopkins</i> .....	34
Mikhail Yurevich Lermontov..... <i>Clarence A. Manning</i> .....	50
Constitutional Progress and the Struggle for Democracy in South Carolina following the Revolution <i>D. Huger Bacot</i> .....	61
The Beautiful Angel and his Biographers <i>Newman I. White</i> .....	73
The Mediaevalism of Henry Adams <i>Herbert L. Creek</i> .....	86
Book Reviews .....	98

## NUMBER 2, APRIL 1925

Negro Leadership since Washington <i>Horace M. Bond</i> .....	115
Political Economy in the Early American College <i>Elbert Vaughan Wills</i> .....	131
High Prices and the Blockade in the Confederacy <i>A. Sellew Roberts</i> .....	154
The Genius of Gusto..... <i>J. Frank Dobie</i> .....	164
"Gorgo": A Great Historical Novel <i>W. Rolfe Brown</i> .....	179
The Religion and History of the Jains <i>Barrows Dunham</i> .....	191
The Diminutive Drama..... <i>Thomas E. Rankin</i> .....	202
Book Reviews .....	213

## NUMBER 3, JULY 1925

Pacifism and the Pacifist..... <i>David Benton Whorton</i> .....	231
Ministers' Sons .....	243
Japanese Indigenous Christianity..... <i>James Cannon III</i> .....	252
Rural Improvement Through Encouragement <i>Caroline B. Sherman</i> .....	264
The Chaos of Congress..... <i>Milledge L. Bonham, Jr.</i> .....	269
The Record of a Broken Friendship <i>Mabel Davidson</i> .....	278

Abasso Garibaldi .....	<i>Olin D. Wannamaker</i> .....	293
The Proposed Amendments to the Articles of Confederation I	<i>George D. Harmon</i> .....	298
Book Reviews .....		316

#### NUMBER 4, OCTOBER 1925

Recollections of General Robert E. Lee	<i>Christiana Bond</i> .....	333
Kossuth and Karolyi.....	<i>Arthur J. May</i> .....	349
"An Imaginary Conversation" of A Victorian and Three Moderns.....	<i>Miriam Bonner</i> .....	363
Milton and the Incomprehensible.....	<i>John H. Collins</i> .....	373
Guadalupe Hidalgo .....	<i>Carleton Beals</i> .....	385
The Romance of American Expansion	<i>Thomas Robson Hay</i> .....	398
The Proposed Amendments to the Articles of Confederation (Concluded) .....	<i>George D. Harmon</i> .....	411
Book Reviews .....		437





# The South Atlantic Quarterly

## The Railroad Labor Board: An Appraisal

CLYDE OLIN FISHER  
Wesleyan University

With the growing complexities of our industrial and our economic life it has seemed necessary to devise new administrative machinery to insure smooth operation and justice to all interests involved. The Interstate Commerce Act, passed by Congress in 1887, marks the real entrance of the federal government into this kind of activity. Likewise, the Federal Trade Commission has been set up to perform certain duties of an administrative nature. During the war many federal agencies were authorized to carry out policies designed to further the general weal. In 1920 Congress passed the Esch-Cummins law, one section of which provided for the creation of the Railroad Labor Board. This is the agency with which the present paper will deal. Summarily stated, the board is designed to settle disputes between railroad managements and railroad labor and to insure the uninterrupted flow of interstate commerce.

Whatever may be the merits of the Labor Board as an agency of industrial peace, there is now an aggressive move to have it abolished or to change the scope of its activities in a radical manner. Naturally, the question arises as to what are the merits of the board and what its claims for continuance. To answer this question intelligently one must not only analyze the work of the board, but must also see that its formation is the last stage reached in a process of gradual evolution. During the last session of Congress the Howell-Barkley bill received a great deal of consideration and the present indications are that Congress must again give attention to this problem.

## POLITICAL PARTIES AND THE LABOR BOARD

President Harding in December, 1922, suggested that the Labor Board be changed so as to have in its membership only neutral members, not representatives of the railways, of the men, and of the public as at present organized. He also desired to have the Labor Board made an integral part of the Interstate Commerce Commission, thus giving to one body jurisdiction over railway income and railway outgo. Incidentally, a great deal can be said on logical grounds for such coördination of work. President Coolidge in his message of December 6, 1923, was more general in his reference to the Labor Board. The gist of his proposition was that the board had been very helpful but that it had not worked with perfection. He suggested that it would be desirable to have the law amended if all parties could agree upon a plan. Secretary of Labor Davis may be said to reflect the opinions of many of the members of his political party. In his report of 1923 he claimed that the board had increased rather than diminished railway labor troubles. Unreasonable delay and the needless magnifying of small controversies into major issues, he held, had resulted. The platform of the Republican party follows in general the suggestions of President Coolidge: "The Labor Board provisions of the present law should be amended whenever it appears necessary to meet changed conditions." No indication is given in the platform as to what the conditions are that would make a change desirable or whether the board should now be abolished. In fact, the platform statement is so general as to be almost meaningless.

Mr. Davis, lately Democratic nominee for the presidency, committed himself to the abolition of the Labor Board in its present form. He favored a "fair and calm discussion" of labor troubles and non-prejudiced mediation and arbitration. But he was opposed to a board with a fixed personnel: "it is better in every way that boards of adjustment or boards of investigation and review, instead of being fixed in their personnel, should be filled by appointment made from time to time as controversies arise." The platform of the Democratic party

in 1924 held that "the labor provisions of the Act have proven unsatisfactory in settling differences between employer and employees."

The LaFollette party was more positive in its hostility than either of the older parties: "We pledge speedy enactment of the Howell-Barkley Bill for the adjustment of controversies between railroads and their employees, which was held up in the last Congress by joint action of reactionary leaders of the Republican and Democratic parties." The enactment of the Howell-Barkley Bill would mean the abolition of the Railroad Labor Board.

#### WHAT IS THE LABOR BOARD?

With this outline of the attitude of the political parties towards the Labor Board, let us inquire into the organization of this agency. Title III of the transportation act of 1920, the so-called Esch-Cummins Law, contains its authorization. The law was enacted when the railroads were returned to private management after the war. The labor provisions of the law were agreed upon only after prolonged conferences and discussions. Senator Cummins was anxious to insert a provision outlawing strikes, but he finally agreed to the elimination of this feature when he became convinced that it would be impossible to secure its adoption. The Senate had already given its approval to a bill in which strikes were made illegal.

The law makes it the duty of railway officials and of employees to use every means at their disposal to prevent disputes that threaten to interrupt interstate commerce. If they cannot agree upon a solution of a difficulty they are to refer the issue to a railway adjustment board provided for in the law, bi-partisan in its nature. Local or regional boards may be established by any carrier and its employees or by any group of carriers and their employees. These boards are to have jurisdiction over grievances that cannot be decided in conference by the opposing factions. But they are not to have jurisdiction over any matter involving wage scales. These belong solely to the Labor Board.

The Railroad Labor Board consists of nine members. Three members are appointed from a group of nine names

suggested by the railway managements; three members from a group of nine names proposed by the employees; and three members are appointed directly by the President of the United States as the representatives of the general public. The President fills any vacancies and appoints any member without nomination by the groups if the latter fail to submit names. A member of the board cannot, during his membership, have a financial interest in a railroad or hold office in a railway labor union.

Disputes as to grievances and working conditions not settled by adjustment boards are to be presented to the Labor Board. The board can also take the initiative in removing a dispute from the jurisdiction of an adjustment board. Disputes as to wages must come directly to the Labor Board if the conferees have been unable to reach an agreement. But the law places upon the managements and the men the obligation to try to reach an agreement first. The carriers or the employees may apply to the Labor Board in a given controversy. Upon written petition of not less than one hundred unorganized employees the board is to take up any case in controversy. The board can also take up a case upon its own initiative.

The Labor Board can, within ten days from date, veto any agreement as to wages that may have been reached by conference of the railways and the men. Otherwise it would be possible to have the roads and the men agree upon rates of wages that would mean a handicap to the shipping public. This veto power, then, is designed in the public interest and against any collusion of railways and men.

In its decisions the Labor Board is to establish "fair wages." The law specifies certain considerations that must be weighed in finding a fair wage:

- Wages paid for similar lines of work in other industries,
- Relation between wages and the cost of living,
- Hazards of the employment,
- Training and skill required,
- Degree of responsibility called for,
- Character and regularity of employment,

Inequalities or increases in wages or treatment, the result of previous wage orders and adjustments.

Especially noticeable is the absence from the criteria of any use of the principle, "standard of living." This, though, may be implied from the relation of "wages and the cost of living." Nor is anything said as to the "ability of the carrier to pay." This criterion, used by the board in a few cases, as will appear later, has constituted one of labor's grievances.

A majority of the nine votes are required for any decision. If the controversy involves wages to be paid, at least one of the three members of the public group must concur in the decision. This, again, is to protect the public from any possible collusion by the management and the labor members of the board.

The only weapon used by the board is that of publicity. It is to publish its decisions and the names of any who violate the orders given. It also publishes the decisions of the adjustment boards. It was contemplated by the framers of the law that such publicity would create a public opinion which would compel the acceptance of the awards of the board. To what extent this expectation has been realized will appear later in the paper.

The Labor Board is instructed, further, to make investigations from time to time and to publish the results of its studies on the relations between the employers and the employees.

#### EARLIER MEASURES TO SETTLE RAILWAY LABOR DISPUTES<sup>1</sup>

The Railroad Labor Board does not constitute the first agency used by the federal government in settling railroad labor disputes. In 1888 Congress passed a law providing for the voluntary arbitration of railway labor disputes and for the investigation of such disputes by a commission to be appointed by the President. Under this law no arbitration proceeding was ever held and only one investigation was carried out under its authority. This was the Cleveland commission to investigate the Chicago Pullman Strike of 1894. While the investi-

<sup>1</sup> For a full discussion of this topic, see the author's analysis in Bulletin No. 303, Bureau of Labor Statistics. Washington, 1922.

gation played no part in settling the strike, it was significant because of the emphasis placed by the commission upon the primacy of the public interests in such controversies.

The law of 1888 opened the way for the enactment of the Erdman act of 1898. The railway brotherhoods had for a number of years sought the enactment of such a law. Mr. Gompers, as a representative of labor, was opposed to legislative action for adjusting these disputes. He finally withdrew his opposition on the ground that the railway laborers were the ones to be affected by the law and that they should have this method if they desired it. This explains why the statute was limited in its application to employees engaged in the train service. The Erdman act, like the law of 1888, provided for voluntary arbitration. No provision was made for a government investigation, such as that of the Pullman strike. A new feature of the law was the provision for mediation and conciliation in labor controversies.

Judge Knapp and Commissioner of Labor Neill, as members of the mediation board, succeeded in settling many difficulties that threatened interruption of interstate commerce. But experience demonstrated certain defects in the machinery and in 1913, largely upon the recommendation of Messrs. Knapp and Neill, the Newlands law was enacted. This law incorporated no new principle and was in reality only a refinement of the Erdman act. Some changes were made in procedure. Provision was made for the use of a large arbitration board when desired. The most important change was the substitution for the old mediators, who were government officials acting in an ex officio capacity, of a United States Board of Mediation and Conciliation with members appointed to give their full time to this work.

In the beginning it looked as though the new agency would be able to insure peace in the railroad labor field. But after a number of decisions had been issued the laborers began to lose confidence in the board, and finally expressed their hostility to it by refusing to submit cases for adjudication. Perhaps one of the chief reasons for this hostility lay in the growing class consciousness of railway labor which found express-

ion in the so-called "concerted movements." In such movements the laborers had a tactical advantage over the employers and they did not care to forego the use of their weapon, the strike, at a time when they were the stronger force.

One of these concerted movements resulted in the passage of the Adamson law in 1916. The mediation board had been unable to settle the controversy which threatened a nation-wide strike. To prevent the strike Congress passed the law giving the men an eight hour day. The law was thrown into the courts and the United States Supreme Court upheld it as an emergency measure to prevent a strike. This particular dispute, however, was settled by the Council of National Defense on the morning of the day in the afternoon of which the court gave its decision.

When, as the result of the entrance of the United States into the war, the President took over the operation of the railroads, new agencies were established to settle railway labor controversies. Besides creating a Division of Labor to look into labor conditions and to give advice to the Director General of Railroads, bi-partisan boards were used to secure industrial peace. A Wage Commission was vested with responsibility for studying the wage problem and recommending changes to be made by the Director General of Railroads. It will be observed that in some respects the law of 1920, as to the settlement of disputes, marks the legislative crystallization of experience had during the war. The adjustment boards authorized by the law of 1920 were designed to follow the plan used in the bi-partisan boards and the Railroad Labor Board was to take over, among other duties, the work performed by the Wage Commission. It is the opinion of the writer that the war agencies functioned with a degree of success that could hardly have been anticipated.<sup>2</sup> All the war agencies were supplanted by new ones provided for in the law of 1920.

#### HOW HAS THE LABOR BOARD WORKED?

One of the unfortunate aspects in the operation of the Esch-Cummins law, as applied to labor, has been the failure to set up the adjustment boards provided for in the act. When the

<sup>2</sup> See ch. 6, Bulletin 303. United States Bureau of Labor Statistics.

labor leaders proposed the formation of such boards the managements expressed a willingness to coöperate only on condition that the laborers give up the so-called "national agreements" which gained such headway during the war period. This difference of view constituted such a barrier that adjustment boards have not been set up in large numbers. Several have been organized but they do not loom so large in the situation as was contemplated by the framers of the law. The controversy over the national agreements has led to this unfortunate result.

In the absence of such adjustment boards the Labor Board has been forced to give consideration to many cases that were of minor importance and which should never have come to the board at all. Consequently, there has been a good deal of congestion on the calendar of the board and delay in giving out decisions. Such delay has been one cause for the growing hostility of labor to the Labor Board. In order to handle the large number of cases the board has had to divide itself into three sections for the hearing of cases and submitting the facts to the full membership of the board for action.

That the board has not been idle is shown by the fact that the decisions rendered have already exceeded two thousand five hundred, some of them important and some of them negligible in significance. In decision No. 2 the laborers were granted substantial increases in wages and it looked as though the employees would become enthusiastic over the work of the board. But when decision No. 147 came in 1921, authorizing a decrease in wages to be paid, another tune was played. This latter decision proved that the board could be relied upon to lower wages when conditions demanded a change, as well as to yield to the pleas of labor for higher pay. But it did not make the Labor Board popular with the rank and file of railway labor.

It was decision No. 147 which gave the initial stimulus to the movement that nearly culminated in a general strike in 1921. President Harding took a hand when the situation looked most desperate. He had the members of the public group of the Labor Board meet with the members of the Interstate Com-



merce Commission in Washington. This was significant in that it showed a recognition of the definite relation between railway income, under the control of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and railway outgo, a large part of which was controlled by the Labor Board.

Subsequently members of the Labor Board issued a memorandum in which they said that they would not reopen the wage matter—the roads were then asking further reduction in wages—until they had passed upon the problems of rules and working conditions. In the meantime the railway managements had promised not to make any further reductions until permitted to do so by order of the board. These two statements, taken together, assured labor against any radical reduction at an early date. They, therefore, withdrew the order to strike and said that they had got a “satisfactory settlement.”

The real explanation for the withdrawal of the strike order is to be found in the marshalling of public opinion against the men. They had let themselves be manouvered into a bad light in the public eye. Professor Dixon has said in a recent book<sup>a</sup> that “no railroad corporation and no reputable labor organization will lightly incur the odium consequent upon a violation of the law.” But Dixon overlooks one very important fact. Public opinion becomes articulate only when the public is put to inconvenience. A strike always means inconvenience to the public. This is the only way in which the men can violate a decision of the board. But the railroads can continue to operate even though the management flouts the authority of the board. The nature of the case is such, therefore, that public opinion crystallizes more readily against the men than against the roads when there is a violation of the order of the board. Naturally, labor does not enthuse over this state of affairs. It was rather freely predicted at the time that the 1921 adjustment would be only temporary, a prediction which proved correct in 1922.

Rules and working conditions were not passed upon by the board in decision No. 2. On April 14, 1921, the board gave its decision on this subject. The national agreement, used during the period of federal control, was the chief issue here.

<sup>a</sup> Railroads and the Government, p. 319.

The roads insisted that national agreements were unfair and unwise and that they should be permitted to negotiate directly, each road with its own employees. But the men felt equally determined to retain what they had won during the war period. The Labor Board ordered the abrogation of national agreements and ordered the roads and the men to get together to form new rules and agreements. The eight hour day and collective bargaining were approved in this decision. Sixteen principles were laid down as a basis in the formulation of the new agreements. One of these protected the men against any discrimination because of membership in a labor union. Another one assured the men the right to be represented by their union officials in the negotiations, if they so desired.

But the railroads and the men disagreed as to the interpretation of this decision. Then the board issued an addendum postponing the abrogation of the national agreements. The board has insisted in a number of cases since that time that the men had a right to be represented by their unions.

The most interesting case to grow out of this situation was that of the Pennsylvania Railroad. The so-called "company ballot" was disapproved by the Labor Board. The company appealed to the courts for an injunction to prevent the publication of its name by the board as in violation of a decision. The courts have ruled against the road but, to date, the road has refused to comply with the decision of the board. This is the clearest case of an out-and-out "flouting" of the authority of the board by a railroad.

The Erie Railroad was censured by the board for having changed the rate of wages with a change in business conditions, but without having followed the procedure outlined in the law. Later the road restored the old wages in obedience to the order of the board. It is an open question whether the law should not be amended in this respect. The railway, according to President Elliott of the Northern Pacific, should be allowed to take the initiative in such matters when business conditions make a change necessary. He would have the reductions reviewed by the Labor Board and its decision made retroactive. Hence the back pay could be collected if the board held against

the road. Obviously, it would not be feasible to make retro-active a decision reducing wages when the men had already collected.

#### THE STRIKE OF 1922

The Labor Board has been criticized because of its failure to prevent the shopmen's strike of 1922. Space does not permit a full discussion of this controversy, but attention should be called to a few points in it. President Harding and the board made numerous attempts to settle the controversy. In a sense, this was a hang-over of the 1921 troubles, although the immediate issue was a reduction of wages granted by the Labor Board. The railroads were quick to appeal to public opinion against the flouting of the authority of the board by the laborers. It did not seem to occur to the railway managements, however, that the railways had preceded the men in taking such an attitude—note the case of the Pennsylvania and other roads.

Public opinion did condemn the strike and labor soon saw that it was fighting a losing battle. The laborers indicated a willingness to return to work at the reduced wages, provided their seniority rights were restored. The President had at one time suggested that these rights be restored. This suggestion the railways refused to accept. Next the President suggested that the men return to work and that the matter of seniority rights be referred to the Labor Board for decision. This did not appeal to the men. The Labor Board had issued the so-called "outlaw" resolution against the strikers and the men, naturally, were unwilling to submit the controversy to a jury which had apparently decided the case in advance against them. This strike presented the novel situation in which the men continued on strike because of an issue created by the strike itself, that of the seniority rights. As was inevitable under the circumstances, the strike was lost by the laborers.

Since that period the Labor Board has rendered a decision that is calculated to make the labor leaders more careful in calling a strike. It has held that the men, by going out on strike, invalidate all the agreements theretofore entered into with the roads. If this decision is to amount to anything—and

there seems to be no reason to doubt that it will serve as a precedent—the laborers now run the risk of losing through the strike gains that have been made in the past. The old rule of “heads, I win; tails, you lose,” has been broken. How much of a deterrent this will prove to the labor leaders is a matter for conjecture.

Up until August 11, 1921, no dissenting opinion had been written by a member of the board. One of the labor members then gave a dissenting opinion and since that time there have been frequent dissents. In some cases the labor members have disagreed as among themselves. They can no longer be counted upon as a “bloc” to stand together in all cases.

The “ability of the carrier to pay” has played a part in shaping the opposition of labor to the board. The law does not include this as one of the criteria to be considered by the board in fixing wages. The board, however, in decision No. 290, said “ability of the carrier to pay” was “entitled to secondary consideration with a certain type of carrier dependent almost entirely on local conditions, or whose principal function in the final analysis is the development and upbuilding of a comparatively new country.”

In several other cases the board has reaffirmed this position. Labor holds that this is an unwarranted assumption on the part of the board, a writing into the law of a principle not contemplated by Congress in its enactment. Further, labor sees no more reason for the consideration of this factor in the payment of wages than for its consideration in the payments made by weak roads for materials. The board members, though, have taken the position that such a principle, if recognized, will help labor in those cases in which insolvency of the roads would result otherwise.

Another factor that has caused a great deal of discontent on the part of labor was the “contracting-out” of repair work by the roads, thus putting the shopmen outside the jurisdiction of the board. This practice played a part in the events leading up to the strike of 1922. Here, however, the board has ruled with labor and has held definitely that the railroads cannot “contract-out” their work as a means of escaping the jurisdiction of the board.

On the piece-work issue the board has also ruled with the men. In one case (decision No. 1360) the board has allowed the piece-work basis for wages when it was agreed upon by the management and the men.

#### VIOLATIONS OF THE ORDERS OF THE LABOR BOARD

During the strike of 1922 a great deal was made of the alleged violation of the orders of the board by the men in their refusal to accept the wage scale prescribed. The law, however, does not obligate either side to accept an award. It merely requires that each go through the procedure prescribed in an attempt to reach a settlement. Chairman Hooper of the Labor Board has said correctly: "the strike of the shopment in 1922 was an absolutely legal strike, owing to the fact that they took every step required by law for them to take before they rejected the decision of the board, which they had the right to do under the terms of the transportation act of 1920."

In the latter part of 1923 Mr. Hooper testified that there had been to date only one real violation of the law by labor. Some employees of the Virginia Railway struck before having gone through the procedure outlined in the law. The board ordered the men to appear before it and they then complied with the terms of the law.

Only recently (June 1924) the representatives of the railway unions have refused to appear before the board to give testimony in a case, basing their refusal upon a challenge of the authority of the board. This case is now in the courts (October 4) and it is uncertain whether the courts will uphold the board or the men.

The railways have surpassed the union in the record of violations of the orders of the board. Mr. Hooper reported that up to April 1, 1924, there had been nineteen clear violations by the railways. The Pennsylvania appears to have been the most flagrant and determined offender. At any rate the railway representatives display a sad lack of sincerity in criticising the men for violations when the managements have sinned in this regard more frequently. It is almost inevitable, however, that disregard should carry with it less of a punish-

ment for the roads than for the men because, as already pointed out, the public is subjected to inconvenience when the men reject a decision of the board. Public opinion in such a case is not slow to crystallize against the men.

Upon the whole, in view of the large number of cases that have been decided by the board, the number of violations has been surprisingly small. This law has been as adequately enforced as have been most other laws that have marked a departure from the beaten paths. The Interstate Commerce Act was not enforced with such success in the early period of its existence as has been the labor section of the transportation act of 1920.

Labor in general is now opposed to having itself denied the privilege of fighting out its own battles. Formerly it was the management which wanted *carte blanche* to fight its own battles. The stronger side has invariably preferred to rely upon itself and to have freedom from legal restraints. This explains, in large part, the reversal of the positions of both sides and the present attitude of each. The employers, in the main, wish to retain the Labor Board, whereas railroad labor is committed to the abolition of the present machinery.

#### THE HOWELL-BARKLEY BILL

Many suggestions have been made from time to time with a view to substituting new machinery for the Labor Board. At the last session of Congress the Senate Committee reported favorably the Howell-Barkley bill and the bill was discussed at length in the House. But adjournment prevented its passage by either branch of Congress. The bill was prepared by labor after a long period of study and the Senate Committee held extensive hearings on it, giving all sides an opportunity to present their views. Generally speaking, the bill was favored by the men and opposed by the managements.

Briefly stated, the proposed bill calls for the organization of adjustment boards of a bi-partisan nature, a board of mediation and conciliation, voluntary arbitration, and a fact-finding commission. Each one of these agencies has at one time or another been used in the settlement of railroad labor disputes.

During federal control the bi-partisan boards played a large part. A fact-finding commission was authorized by the law of 1888. Both the Erdman act and the Newlands law provided for mediation and conciliation and for arbitration. Labor is now requesting the reinstatement of agencies which it has opposed violently at earlier periods. The cause is not difficult to find: disappointment at the results obtained through the operation of the present law and a preference for the other methods which, in retrospect, look less disadvantageous.

The writer is of the opinion that the act of 1920 is a logical development in the settlement of railway labor controversies. Upon the whole the law has been a success. Possibly a changing personnel, with men selected from a large panel for each controversy, would be more acceptable to labor. But something would be lost in the continuity of policy and in efficiency which is based upon experience. Some of the present members of the board have given the appearance of being hide-bound and prejudiced. But the general philosophy underlying the law appears to be sound and, if permitted to work out its solution and to profit from the mistakes made in the past, the board should operate with less friction in the future. At any rate, the measure has been an interesting one in the development of the scope and activities of the federal government, and there is little likelihood that the contesting parties will ever again be allowed to fight out their battles with a sublime disregard to the interests of the public.

## The Amenities of an English Election

WILLIAM THOMAS MORGAN  
University of Indiana

### I

For the last quarter century, British politics has been in a state of flux; in the last two decades no single party has really controlled both houses of Parliament. The Boer war produced a definite reaction against Protection and Economic Imperialism, as evidenced by the election of 1905, which brought into power a new, reinvigorated Liberal party. The Lloyd George budget of 1909 was at once a definite challenge to the territorial aristocracy and a thorough-going program of social reform; and as such it galvanized into action the landed nobility, who controlled more than one-sixth of the soil of the United Kingdom. The House of Lords boldly assumed responsibility for vetoing this important measure, thereby raising two important constitutional questions. Could the Lords prevent the enactment of any measure demanded by the majority of the Commons? Did the peers have the right to veto revenue bills, which must originate in the lower house? Twice since 1905 the Lords had defeated important measures fathered by the Liberals, and now they had dared lay impious hands upon finance! The Liberals accepted the challenge, and appealed to the country on the budget. They received an insignificant plurality over their rivals, but in combination with the Irish Nationalists and Laborites they passed the budget and appealed a second time that year to the electorate, this time on the question of "ending or mending" the House of Lords. The results were the same as before, and they remained in power through the grace of the two minor parties.

In their dependent position the Liberals committed themselves to Home Rule for Ireland and extensive social reform for the workers. The years 1911 to 1914 were notable for the volume of advanced social legislation, a movement which was unfortunately suspended during the recent world cataclysm. In the heat of this conflict, political lines tended to disappear; the Liberal-Labor combination gave way to a Coalition, which



Lloyd George's Victory election in 1918 returned to power with a top-heavy majority. It had already become almost purely Liberal and Conservative in its make-up, as Labor, insistent upon regaining its freedom of action, had reorganized on a broader basis during the war. Lloyd George as premier found to his cost the truth of the two century-old dictum of Defoe that the English were still

"A discontented nation and by far  
Harder to rule in time of peace than war."

The Liberals gravitated one by one to Mr. Asquith's standard, leaving the erstwhile Radical Liberal entirely surrounded by Conservatives.

The disillusionment of peace had quickly swept from power Mr. Wilson, Signor Orlando and M. Clemenceau. Only the adroit Welsh premier continued at the helm during the dreary years 1920 to 1922, and that only at the cost of his tremendous popularity gained during the war. The disappointment as to reparations, the failure of reconstruction, and the continuance of serious unemployment all served to bring the ministry into disrepute, which was accentuated by the honors scandal and the heavy expense of the secretariat. The ultra-Conservatives (the "Diehards") were eager to win recognition inside their own party, and made Lloyd George's task increasingly difficult. Early in 1922 they threatened to secede from the Coalition and were only kept in line by the efforts of the "first class brains" of Winston Churchill, Austen Chamberlain and Lord Birkenhead.

The unsatisfactory relations with France added to the unpopularity of the ministry. English prestige in the Near East, furthermore, had suffered a mortal blow through the collapse of the Greek armies in the late summer of 1922, which led Lloyd George to issue his "delirious manifesto" of September 19, summoning the British Empire and the Little Entente to a crusade against the infidel Turk. Europe was thrown into a state of nervous excitement such as she had not experienced since 1914; the cabinet in London and the British commander at Constantinople saw nothing save war, but the forbearance of the Turk and the tact of General Harrington averted hos-

tilities. Lloyd George was now doomed. The Diehards made the most of his great unpopularity for having brought England to the verge of war, and despite the entreaties of Lord Balfour coupled with those of Austen Chamberlain and Lord Birkenhead, they voted at the Carlton Club meeting two to one to end the Coalition. Lloyd George resigned immediately, Bonar Law formed a Conservative ministry and forthwith called an election.

The Laborites had first secured their freedom from the Coalition, the Asquithian or Independent Liberals (Wee Frees) had then followed them, so that when the Conservatives withdrew, the eloquent Welshman was left marooned without a policy on the eve of an election. In that respect his followers differed little however from the Conservatives and Independent Liberals. The election manifestoes of the Lloyd Georgians, the Asquithians and the Conservatives eloquently testify that there may be distinctions without any real differences. Labor alone had a clear-cut policy, and that the capital levy, which for England, at least, was thoroughly revolutionary.

The election was dull and uninteresting; not even the personal animosities of a few politicians could enliven it; even Lloyd George had lost his magnetism; Labor alone displayed any enthusiasm. To the surprise of every one, even themselves, the Conservatives obtained a decisive majority. Equally to the astonishment and chagrin of the Liberals, Labor secured more seats than both their factions, and quietly assumed the rôle of "His Majesty's Loyal Opposition." Many constituencies had three or more candidates, and as a consequence a large proportion of the fortunate candidates were elected by a minority of the voters. The Conservatives, in fact, had little more than a third of the votes, but gained over five-ninths of the members.

The Conservative majority soon appeared unwieldy and undisciplined, and the majority of intelligent men began to clamor for some constitutional changes that would in the future make a minority Government an impossibility. Mr. Bonar Law found it most difficult to keep his wild young men under control. Lacking an able debater among the Commoners to

defend his policies, the invalid premier literally killed himself by his efforts on the floor of the Commons. Economic conditions did not mend, while Liberals and Laborites by their able attacks upon the ministry soon destroyed any transient popularity the party may have enjoyed. Unemployment, together with intolerable housing conditions and a spineless foreign policy, brought defeat in the by-elections to three ministers in as many days.

The controversy with France over reparations augmented the general discontent with the ministry. Bonar Law had practically ignored Mr. Hughes's New Haven suggestion for a committee to examine anew into Germany's ability to pay, solacing himself with a courteous protest against the French invasion of the Ruhr. The situation was not improved by his retirement in favor of Mr. Baldwin, and Anglo-French relations showed evident signs of tension. By midsummer, British public opinion was definitely opposed to the French occupation of the Ruhr. Then, Mr. Baldwin and Lord Curzon sent a White Paper, accompanied by a stiff note, to M. Poincaré, asking that the entire reparations problem be reopened by means of open diplomacy. Poincaré's dilatory, vigorous reply increased English bitterness. Mr. Baldwin, however, retired into seclusion, only to be frightened by the Corfu incident into placing himself at the mercy of Poincaré by a foolish press communique, describing his meeting with the French premier in Paris.

With economic conditions growing worse daily, and English diplomatic prestige at a low ebb, Mr. Baldwin looked for relief to his conference with the Dominion premiers in October. Premier Smuts' announcement during that meeting aroused considerable interest, and for a moment it seemed possible that the United States might join the British Empire in a protest against the Ruhr policy; but the coolness of President Coolidge, the timidity of Mr. Baldwin, and the cleverness of M. Poincaré prevented any such move. The dominion premiers were soon found more intent upon preferential tariffs than on reparations, and steadily emphasized the benefit to the United Kingdom of a policy of Protection and Imperial Preference, which might prove the best remedy for unemployment. Mr. Baldwin openly

proclaimed his conversion to this new faith in a speech at Plymouth, October 25. He suggested that a system of Protection would strengthen his hand in economic and diplomatic affairs as well as improve Great Britain's relations with her colonies.<sup>1</sup> He seems to have felt, moreover, that a tariff might guard to some degree against the danger of French supremacy in the iron industry. The control gained by France since the war over the great mineral resources of Alsace Lorraine, the Saar basin and the Ruhr, when added to what she had already possessed before the war, gave her an excellent opportunity to secure an ascendancy in the steel industry at British expense. Some English business men began to suspect Poincaré of a close understanding with the *Comité des Forges*, if not indeed with Herr Stinnes as well!

Two difficulties stood in Mr. Baldwin's way in adopting a system of Protection: Bonar Law's pledge not to make any drastic change in the fiscal system, and the necessity of taxing food. Mr. Baldwin hoped to find a way around both obstacles. At least this is the most natural explanation of his Plymouth speech, which seems to have been a sort of trial balloon sent up to see how the wind lay. Apparently he and his advisers found the omens favorable, as he at once further elaborated his plans in speeches at Swansea and Manchester. The premier little realized, perhaps, how quickly the country could be aroused by his references to tariffs and unemployment.<sup>2</sup> Sir Alfred Mond, Lloyd George's henchman, awakened considerable interest in the matter by insisting that Imperial Preference and Protection were clearly forbidden by the pledge of Mr. Bonar Law. The Liberals accused Mr. Baldwin of having, with malice aforethought, brought on an election, whereas Conservatives such as Viscount Peel maintained that the country had forced the issue. There is something of truth in both contentions. The premier did not foresee the consequences of his Plymouth speech, but once an election was decided upon, largely upon the advice of his Diehard support-

<sup>1</sup> H. Cox, *Sunday Times*, December 9, 1923.

<sup>2</sup> Ramsay MacDonald, *Socialist Review*, December, 1923. Mr. Baldwin never made any sudden decision to appeal to the country; he suggested it tentatively, and was violently forced into it. A. Ponsonby, *Contemporary Review*, January, 1924. The *Morning Post* (October 27, 1923) quoted the opinions of twenty-five representative British papers on the Plymouth speech.

ers,<sup>3</sup> he favored having it over with as speedily as possible. When Parliament reassembled the dissolution was set for three days later, and the pollings twenty days thereafter.<sup>4</sup>

No one, except possibly the Diehards and certain sections of the press, wanted an election. The immediate result of Mr. Baldwin's decision was to divide the Conservatives, unite the two wings of the Liberals, and arouse the class consciousness of the disgruntled Laborites.<sup>5</sup> One group of the Conservatives, strongly supported by the millionaire press, demanded a throughgoing system of Protectionism on the lines laid down by Joseph Chamberlain twenty years before.<sup>6</sup> Other prominent leaders, such as Lord Derby and Lord Cecil, were in reality, perhaps, free traders, who were not at all convinced that Protection would prove a sovereign specific for unemployment and economic depression. On the eve of the election, Mr. Baldwin attempted to strengthen his Government by the inclusion of Austen Chamberlain and Lord Birkenhead, but he was thwarted by the Diehart contingent, led, it was said, by two of the undersecretaries, who threatened to resign if the arrangement were completed.

For the Liberals, Mr. Asquith appeared more vigorous than for years. Lloyd George, the prodigal son of the Liberals, having regained his accustomed confidence and enthusiasm from his warm reception in America, was received back into the fold, and carried the banner of free trade hither and thither with fiery zeal against the champions of Protectionism. Labor, although in the doldrums financially, utilized its excellent organization very effectively under the skillful leadership of Macdonald, ably assisted by Clynes and Henderson. The interest and enthusiasm of the rank and file exceeded even the expectations of their leaders, who enjoyed the advantage of a clear and definite policy.

## II

So much for the background of the election. As far as the main issue was concerned, the Conservatives had taken the country back exactly twenty years. Unfortunately some of the

<sup>3</sup> *Weekly Manchester Guardian*, December 7, 1923.

<sup>4</sup> *London Gazette*, November 16, 1923.

<sup>5</sup> *Spectator*, December 15, 1923.

<sup>6</sup> See Lord Beaverbrook's editorial, *Daily Express*, December 5, 1923.

conspicuous members of the party were practically oblivious of the fact that there had been a world war in the interim. Without attempting to deal with the results of the poll, which has long since become a matter of common knowledge, it is interesting to note some of the sidelights on the election, which was certainly the bitterest Great Britain had witnessed since 1910. The position of the press was such as to give credence to many curious and interesting rumors relative to the antics of the great press barons. One such report was so often repeated, and accepted as true by so many persons, that it might well have played an important rôle in deciding the outcome of the election.

The Conservatives decided upon a dissolution while Lloyd George was still in mid-ocean. Soon after his return, the *Daily Herald* and the *Morning Post* began to speak in measured terms of what soon became known as the "Press Conspiracy." These two papers maintained that immediately upon his landing, Lloyd George, together with Austen Chamberlain and Lord Birkenhead, were invited to a luncheon by Lord Beaverbrook. Here, so the organs of Labor and of the High Tories maintained, it was agreed that the three statesmen, assisted by the influential Rothermere-Beaverbrook press syndicate, should endeavor to encompass the defeat of both Labor and Conservatism, and bring in a Center party, presumably under Lloyd George or Lord Birkenhead, which would save the nation from the twin evils of Socialism and "Standpat" Toryism. The rumor fell upon rich soil, as the general nervousness of the thinking public had very recently suffered another shock, when the Hulton syndicate was swallowed up by the press anaconda controlled by the two great noblemen, who were now in charge of papers with a circulation of some twenty-six millions daily. The ambiguous, vacillating attitude towards Mr. Baldwin by their journals, usually classed as Conservative, convinced many people that the public was being dragged into an election to make a Roman holiday for the press trust.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>7</sup> For examples of spirited diatribes against the press barons, see the *Spectator*, the *Nation* and *Athenaeum*, and the *New Statesman*, December 1, 1923; J. L. Garvin, *Observer*, December 9, 1923; Sir Evelyn Cecil, *Contemporary Review*, January, 1924; W. S. Sparrow, *19th Century*, January, 1924; Sir A. Hopkinson, *Contemporary*, January, 1924. Labor of course made much of the actions of the press trust as representing the hostility of the plutocracy toward Labor.

The attitude of the sensational dailies in and about London during the election was thoroughly bewildering. The editorial pages of the *Daily Mail* rivalled those of the *Daily Express* in their position, not only with reference to the parties concerned, but more particularly as to individuals. Neither Rothermere nor Beaverbrook came out definitely against Mr. Baldwin or Protection, and they maintained throughout that they were fighting for the best interests of the Conservative party. Nevertheless, they weakened the Conservative campaign by innuendos and sly attacks upon the prime minister. Half hearted in their support of the Conservatives, they never came out definitely and pointedly against the Liberals. On frequent occasions they heaped compliments upon Lord Birkenhead, Lloyd George and Winston Churchill. If they aimed at mystifying their readers, they were most successful, as they left the voters, more particularly those in the London areas, completely without the definite guidance they usually expected from their favorite papers. Of course all the syndicated press attacked the program of Labor, but failing to give their readers a definite lead, left many of them in so great bewilderment in the face of a great economic issue such as Protection, that they failed to do their duty on the day of the pollings.

Many careful students of politics believed that the ambiguous stand of the more popular press caused many people to believe in its entirety the story of the "Press Conspiracy," and this must have had no inconsiderable influence upon the outcome of the elections.

The attacks upon the press syndicate, moreover, did not cease with the elections. In fact they have increased in bitterness, if not in frequency since last March.<sup>8</sup> The press as an agent of public opinion is unquestionably in a bad way in England at the moment, and one can well sympathize with the views of such men as Strachey of the *Spectator* and Garvin of the *Observer* who feel that the minds of the rank and file are being systematically debauched by the papers that seek to give them what they want. Fortunately, the *Times* is once more faithful

<sup>8</sup> See J. P. Collins, *19th Century*, June, 1924; *National Review*, June, 1924; *Quarterly Review*, January, 1924; *Spectator*, March and May, 1924, *passim*. In some quarters there is a fear that William Randolph Hearst might gain a foothold in British journalism.

to the best of its traditions, the *Morning Post* has been saved by some staunch old Tories and the *Daily Herald*, although in chronic financial difficulties, seeks to uphold the principles of the Labor party, and is taken by the most intelligent and loyal of the laboring classes. It must be added, however, that the great mass of the workers, if they read anything at all, prefer the sports page and the illustrated sections of the other penny papers.

Another rumor which went the rounds also aroused considerable interest. The Diehards asserted that Mr. Lloyd George had, during his brief triumphal journey through the United States, become a thorough convert to Protection, and fully intended to come out for that policy as a campaign issue in the next election. For that reason they had hurried their plans somewhat, and stampeded the Conservatives into stealing his platform thunder, by pronouncing for Protection while Lloyd George was still in the middle of the Atlantic. The statement was used so persistently during the canvass, that once the elections were over Lloyd George felt called upon to write to the press, declaring it to be a "pure invention without a shred of truth in it."<sup>9</sup>

Other factors less spectacular than the so-called "Press Conspiracy" and the canard that Lloyd George had become a Protectionist were working in this election, without many of the politicians realizing their force. Of these few were more influential than the sentiment for increasing the facilities for education, both elementary and secondary. The Laborites maintained that no child should be handicapped in his struggle for existence by a lack of the fundamentals of a sound education. They pointed out, too, that the immediate result of excusing boys and girls of 14 from further school attendance at this particular time was adding to the number of the unemployed, and indirectly increasing the poor law doles. Labor was exceedingly caustic in its remarks about a Government that could squander millions of pounds in Mesopotamia, and at the same time leave hundreds of thousands of boys and girls without proper educational facilities. Sir John Simon for the Liberals and Mr. Bald-

<sup>9</sup> The *Times*, December 20, 1923.



win for the Conservatives, spent considerable time discussing educational problems, as they knew the powerful appeal the subject held.<sup>10</sup>

Various teachers' organizations, which are growing steadily in their importance in Great Britain, were most industrious and reasonably successful in fighting for larger educational appropriations. They memorialized candidates for Parliament, and frequently sent questionnaires to the leading ones. These questions, along with the answers vouchsafed by the respective candidates, were often published in the provincial papers. Most intelligent people among the middle, as well as the laboring classes, condemned the drastic economies practiced by the ministry in cutting down the amount for free scholarships in the secondary schools to one-third of what it had been. Labor made a great point of the fact that the Government was spending approximately ten times as much per boy in the army schools as in the average Board school, whereas the cost per capita for the inmates of prisons and correctional institutions was still higher. They noted, more or less incidentally, that the drink bill was six times as large as that for education.<sup>11</sup>

Another factor of greater importance than is usually believed by British politicians, is a growing demand for a stricter regulation of the liquor trade, which came in for some hard knocks during the course of the election. These attacks came not alone from the Liberals, nor from the Laborites, who insinuated that the Conservatives were always at the beck and call of the liquor interests, but also from serious Conservative journalists as well as from Viscountess Astor. This enterprising peeress, with her Virginian background, was not content to sit idly by while her husband represented the family in the House of Lords; so she stood for the House of Commons, and was for some months the only woman in the Commons. Nor was she willing to be one of the silent majority. From the beginning of her political career she has taken a vital interest in social reform, and she

<sup>10</sup> "Education in this country must go forward; the policy of enabling children to pass from the elementary schools by way of the secondary schools has my warmest support." Mr. Baldwin's speech. *Weekly Manchester Guardian*, December 3, 1923. Sir John Simon's speech in the Commons, March 23, 1923.

<sup>11</sup> Letter to *Manchester Guardian*, December 3, 1923; *Daily Herald*, December 7, 1923; *Manchester Guardian*, December 5, 1923; Army school figures ran from £93 to £127 a year. County Council schools averaged less than £12.

at once began to see the need of some change in the regulation of public houses (saloons). She made some of her staid Conservative colleagues in the Lower House most uncomfortable with her advanced notions about the welfare of women and children. In fact she charged them with a general hostility to such legislation, and said it was "the only party which opposes the leaders of all the Christian churches on temperance. In Parliament, the main attacks on bills to keep juveniles out of public houses or protect young girls from criminal assault . . . has come from Conservative members of Parliament." Throughout the island appears a growing dislike of the brewery interests, and the system by which they are able to make £5,000,000 a year greater profits than before the war.<sup>12</sup> Mr. Clynes wrote in the *English Review* (October, 1923) that the Government received in beer duties £8 for every one it spent on unemployment doles, and that these duties alone were almost sufficient to pay all unemployment benefits, old age insurance, and the pensions arising out of the Great War. The trend of public opinion is not towards prohibition, but rather toward the nationalization of the traffic in drink and the elimination of all private profit in its sale. "One of the features of the election," wrote the *Spectator* (December 15, 1923), "has been the failure of those candidates . . . associated with the trade and the success of those who have temperance reform as one of their objects." It is becoming increasingly obvious to politicians, as well as to business men, that excessive or long continued indulgence in alcoholic drinks is fatal to the highest industrial efficiency, and however much they may sneer at American prohibition, and smile at stories of bootlegging across the Atlantic, they fear in their hearts the competition of the sober, industrious nation overseas. The increasing interest in the Bishop of Oxford's local option bill is proof sufficient of their desire for a change.

### III

Inasmuch as the shifty attitude of the popular newspapers was satisfactory to but few of the people, the importance of

<sup>12</sup> *Spectator*, December 12, 1923, and January 9, 1924. The *Daily Herald* complained that the well known distillers, Buchanan-Dewar, Ltd., made a profit of £2,500,000 on a capital of approximately £7,000,000.

the platform as a means of clearing up difficulties acquired a fresh significance in this election. The economic questions brought up by the issue of Protection were many and they were decidedly complex. Before the election was well under way, it was clear that the platform was replacing the press as the most effective means of crystallizing public opinion, although it must be conceded that the floods of cartoons and posters put out by each party, and more particularly by the Liberals, who seem to have spent not wisely, but too well, were effective in gaining public attention.

The election meetings were as a rule exceptionally well attended, and the audiences were usually most desirous of enlightenment. Unfortunately many of these meetings made up in interest what they lacked in decorum, for the behaviour of the "hecklers" did not as a general thing add to the comfort of the political speakers. A large number of the meetings were exceedingly noisy, and in several instances the candidate had to abandon them. This tendency was particularly prevalent in the working-class suburbs of London and Glasgow. At North Battersea, a London suburb, the Liberal candidate was compelled to give up all his meetings on account of the rowdyism,<sup>13</sup> but he had the satisfaction of being returned at the head of the poll. South Battersea was the scene of an undignified struggle, in which Viscount Curzon, the Conservative candidate, who was accused by the Labor leaders of travelling about with an armed body guard of undesirable citizens, had some exciting experiences. As the finale of one of his meetings, "windows were broken, electric light shades smashed, chairs were thrown about . . . . The parties separated into opposing forces and formed rival fronts, which wavered backwards and forwards with the fortunes of the battle . . . . till the police came and cleared the hall."<sup>14</sup> It was thereupon announced that Captain Viscount Curzon "had been reluctantly compelled to cancel two women's meetings . . . in the interests of public safety."<sup>15</sup>

<sup>13</sup> *Manchester Guardian*, December 4, 1923; *Spectator*, December 8.

<sup>14</sup> *Daily Herald*, December 5. A similar account is found in *Evening Standard* (December 5) which adds that "Wild looking men were screaming vile epithets, and generally behaving as one would expect savages to behave, but not decent British workmen."

<sup>15</sup> *Times*, December 5; *Manchester Guardian*, December 6, 1923.

In West Bermondsey (a third London suburb) Liberal meetings were held under similar difficulties. A threat to prosecute the trouble makers served only to increase the fury of the crowd, and an athletic ex-member who tried to chastise the offenders, awoke later in a hospital. Another Liberal meeting at Mile End "ended in disorder,"<sup>16</sup> and fear of trouble prevented the Conservatives from holding any meetings there at all. In the Whitechapel district of London there were complaints of organized rowdyism. In Edmonton the Conservative candidate had to abandon his meetings. The same was true of the Conservative meetings at North Tottenham.<sup>17</sup>

Glasgow also had a few turbulent sessions. In one district the Conservative candidate (a woman) was kicked so that she was compelled by her physician to cancel at least one day's meetings. At Port Glasgow a local Conservative enthusiast split a youth's head open with a chair. Reports were current that several women, most of them wives or relatives of candidates, were either insulted or injured. The women were by no means always on the defensive, however. During a wild scene in the Central Portsmouth constituency, "a woman who frantically waved her red hat was pounced upon by other women, and the hat went sailing across the room." At West Bromley they were said to be equally active, and the only person expelled from a noisy Conservative meeting at North Lambeth was an attractive member of the fair sex.<sup>18</sup>

The Chamberlain brothers found making election speeches an arduous and dangerous pastime. Austen Chamberlain tried in vain for an hour to secure a hearing at West Bromwich, but had to give up when two disturbers in fancy dress arrived, one of them wearing a silk hat and a monocle. West Belfast, Ladywood, Sheffield, Neath, Kettering and Central Portsmouth also reported serious disturbances.<sup>19</sup>

Although the number of really serious injuries was few, the Conservative papers spoke of the elections, being "marred by a most unpleasant outbreak of rowdyism in South London

<sup>16</sup> *Daily Herald*, December 5, 1923.

<sup>17</sup> *Manchester Guardian*, December 4; *Times*, December 6, 1923.

<sup>18</sup> *Spectator*, December 8; *Times*, December 6 and 7; *Evening Standard*, December 5, 1923.

<sup>19</sup> *Daily Herald*, *Evening Standard*, and *Times*, December 5, 1923; *Manchester Guardian*, December 4, 6, 1923.

and elsewhere."<sup>20</sup> "The later stages of the election campaign," notes a *Times* editorial (December 7), "has been disgraced by a number of cases of cowardly ruffianism involving not only the complete suppression of free speech, but some organized attacks on candidates, and even on the women of their families." The *Weekly Guardian* editorial of the same date, however, says that "on the whole, we seem to have been better natured than ever before. In the old election they used, unless all the records deceive, to talk about tyrants, traitors and snakes in the grass to an extent that would only cause the modern order to laugh." In the main, it must be noted, that the bitterness in the numerous triangular contests was generally between the Liberal and Conservative candidates.

Throughout their comments on "hooliganism" (as they termed it), the daily papers insinuated that it was the work of overzealous Laborites whom their leaders could not or would not control. The *Daily Herald* resented this in outspoken terms, reminding Labor's rivals that election rowdiness existed long before the advent of the Labor party, and insisted that the police did not afford the same protection to Labor meetings that they did to others.<sup>21</sup>

Despite the examples just given, the amount of "hooliganism" does not bulk large when one recalls that more than 1400 candidates were in the field and the number of election meetings was correspondingly large. These disturbances are really symptomatic of the disgust of the lower orders over the failure of the Conservative Government after a year of power to do anything to remedy the evil of unemployment. It is scarcely to be expected that people who are suffering from hunger together with a lack of proper food and shelter should have supported the existing ministry. Few Conservatives realized the terrible discontent, resulting from the terrible misery suffered in the slum areas. Even the weather seems to have conspired against the Ministry, for it was unusually cold and disagreeable during a part of the election campaign. Canvassers in the working dis-

<sup>20</sup> *Spectator*, December 8, 1923.

<sup>21</sup> *Daily Herald*, December 5, 6, 1923; *Weekly Manchester Guardian* and *Times*, December 7, 1923. At least one Labor candidate was submitted to the humiliation of having his house decorated with Conservative posters and a new coat of red paint. *Evening Standard*, December 5, 1923.

tricts reported awful destitution in their house to house visits, which were resented by certain types of the poor. The Conservative party had little conception of the discontent that was rife. They seemed to have been equally oblivious of the political importance of the women, who unquestionably suffered more from the general unemployment than did the men. The mother, surrounded by a hungry brood of children, could not for an instant get away from her troubles, and her resentment against the Government that permitted such conditions to exist, was, perhaps, even more bitter than that of her husband.

The Conservative Government was prepared to carry on its campaign on a platform designed in their minds to remedy the crying evil of unemployment, but their political enemies made the fight one against dear food, which they insisted must come in with Protection. Here again, the position of the women was all important. So much so that the Conservatives maintained that the dear food cry proved to be the decisive argument in the campaign.<sup>22</sup> Certain it is that few of the working classes understood the manifold implications of a system of Protection, but every woman who did the marketing had a most vivid idea of what dearer food meant for her family.

Despite the various and varying prophecies of the political experts, few persons realized what would be the outcome of the elections. The Conservatives expected a slight reduction in their strength; the Liberals hoped to make some definite gains at the expense of Laborites and Conservatives; Labor anticipated some additions to their voting strength in the Commons as a result of the betterment of their organization since the election of the year before. None of them were prepared, however, for what actually happened. Bonar Law had started the year with a clear majority of about 80 votes over both the Liberals and Conservatives; Mr. Baldwin found himself in a minority of 100, and for the "first time since June, 1885, there was "no majority for any party in the Commons."<sup>23</sup>

<sup>22</sup> *Quarterly Review*, January, 1924.

<sup>23</sup> J. L. Garvin, *Observer*, December 9, 1923.

## IV

The Conservatives retained about 260 seats, Labor was more successful than the reunited Liberals, having some forty-five more than the Liberal quota of 155. Curiously enough, although the Conservatives had polled the heaviest vote, their party policy of Protection had been repudiated by a large majority of the electorate. Moreover, the party as a whole had lost the confidence of the country, and could not remain in power for a single hour without some support from the Liberals or Laborites, neither of whom seemed disposed to give it. For a few weeks people were much in the dark as to what the final solution would be. Many enterprising journalists and politicians pleaded for a new Conservative-Liberal Coalition, but the public at large detested Coalitions, and the general effect of the rumor about the "Press Conspiracy" was such as make the more obvious leaders of such a group hesitate long before accepting such a doubtful honor under such novel conditions.

Some nervous patriots appealed to Mr. Asquith to save the country from the danger of a Labor Government, but their petition fell on deaf ears, because the venerable Liberal leader was equally unwilling to support the proponents of Protection or sink the individuality of his own party. Soon after the holiday recess, therefore, since Mr. Baldwin refused to resign except in the face of a hostile majority, he was compelled to hand in his resignation to the king after being defeated by a Liberal-Labor combination. George V. called upon Mr. J. Ramsay MacDonald to form a ministry. He accepted the task, and the first Labor Government in the history of the United Kingdom assumed office, with the implied understanding that it would be supported by the Liberals so long as it would not attempt to carry out such radical measures as the nationalization of the means of production or the Capital Levy.

While the world awaited the solution of the ministerial problem, the election had emphasized the need of two constitutional reforms. If the House of Commons is to see three approximately equal parties in it, the old expedients—sufficient for a two party system—will have to be altered or modified.

Should the Commons, on account of the three parties, enter into a deadlock, it seems necessary that the House of Lords assert its influence once more. To do it successfully an extensive reform of that dignified assembly is necessary. Lord Birkenhead<sup>24</sup> has pleaded with his colleagues to bring about a change in its organization, that it might resume its place as an equal of the Lower House.<sup>25</sup> It is possible that the Labor Government might have taken steps to reduce the membership, increase the representative nature, and restore the veto to the House of Lords if its life had been longer.

Largely as a result of the elections of 1922, 1923 and 1924 the advocates of the various expedients to make the election more representative have flourished. Various suggestions concerning Proportional Representation, the Alternative Vote, and the Referendum are urged to prevent the recurrence of deadlocks and of a situation where no single party can govern without the consent and approval of one of the others. It seems possible, therefore, that a law providing either for an Alternative Vote or some form of Proportional Representation may soon be passed even by the Conservatives.

After some nine months of life, what may be said of the Labor Ministry? No one denies the ability of such sterling characters as Mr. MacDonald, Mr. Sidney Webb, Lord Haldane, and Mr. Clynes. Responsibility has sobered the Labor leaders, and the Labor party has gained much by this opportunity of governing the kingdom. Its left wing will probably be more patient with their leaders, and content to have the Labor policy carried out slowly. The greatest single need of the Labor party was experience in office, for before they can hope to hold their own with the older parties, they must develop a group of men from whom they may be able to recruit a body of permanent administrators, of which the under secretaries of state are the most important. For a time Mr. MacDonald was able to keep the radical group reasonably quiet, but they were far from satisfied, inasmuch as economic conditions do not mend very rapidly.

<sup>24</sup> Speech in the House of Lords, January 15, 1924.

<sup>25</sup> Martin Conway, *Fortnightly*, September, 1923.



In the nine months the Laborites were in power, they did well, despite the baptism of strikes which ushered them into office. They proved their ability, their patience and their fair-mindedness. They showed, moreover, that when the crucial test comes, they preferred to put the interests of the country above the interests of the social class that called them to power. Furthermore, they failed to show such definite revolutionary tendencies as had been feared by so many of the respectable classes. This was not due so much to the safety device by which they were permitted to form a ministry, which depended upon the good will of one or the other of the older parties, as to their realization of the inherent difficulty of tampering with the complex industrial organization of their country. Even the most confirmed Tories were surprised by the moderation shown in Mr. Snowden's budget, which was received with general satisfaction by all parties and classes.

To Mr. MacDonald was left by the Baldwin ministry an even more perplexing heritage than strikes. Anglo-French relations were in just as delicate a situation last January as they had been the previous September, for M. Poincaré was just as determined as ever to carry on his policy in the Ruhr. Despite an interchange of good wishes, the two premiers made no progress, and the unexpected defeat of the French prime minister brought into power a party which had much in common with that of Mr. MacDonald. M. Herriott and Mr. MacDonald did agree upon a policy with regard to Germany, which France as a whole would support, and they were making a serious effort to settle reparations when the sudden dissolution and election last October returned the Conservatives to power with a clear majority of more than 200.

## Jane Austen's "Love and Freindship": A Study in Literary Relations

ANNETTE B. HOPKINS

Goucher College

The advent of a long needed critical edition<sup>1</sup> of Jane Austen's novels is being welcomed with deserved cordiality. It is to be regretted, however, that a work so inclusive in its informational and illustrative material should not have extended to a complete edition. Mr. Chapman's limitation of the Austen writings to the six major novels would doubtless be more in accord with the author's own preference than an edition which officially brought to light very personal, preliminary and unfinished pieces carefully preserved by her from the public eye. But since these pieces are now all in print in a variety of forms,<sup>2</sup> it would scarcely have been treating Miss Austen's sensibilities with disrespect to have included in the present edition *Lady Susan*, the unfinished *Watsons*, the letters and the highly interesting, recently published volume, *Love and Freindship*.

The *juvenilia* of a great writer are seldom if ever without interest, for they may be at once a product and a portent. They may point back to literary ancestry; they may point forward, indicating the course along which genius will unfold itself. Miss Austen's youthful essays in the art of fiction are no exception to these observations, barring the fact that they proclaim her literary inheritance only to repudiate it as unblushingly as her romantic heroes disavow parental authority. To quote her nephew, James Edward Austen-Leigh, the second of six or eight of the Austen family to pay biographical respect to their illustrious relative, thereby proving that at least one prophet has not been without honor by her own fireside,

<sup>1</sup> *The Novels of Jane Austen*. The text based on collation of the early editions, by R. W. Chapman. The Oxford University Press, 1923.

<sup>2</sup> *A Memoir of Jane Austen* by her nephew J. E. Austen-Leigh. 2nd ed. to which is added *Lady Susan* and fragments of two other unfinished tales by Miss Austen [One of these is *The Watsons*]. London, 1871.

*The Watsons*, by Jane Austen concluded by L. Oulton. N. Y., 1923. This attempt to complete a story that Miss Austen had evidently preferred to drop can not be called a success. *Letters of Jane Austen* ed. with an introduction and critical remarks, by Edward, Lord Brabourne. London, 1884; also in the Winchester ed. of the novels, vols. XI and XII, Edinburgh, 1911-12. *Love and Freindship and Other Earlier Works* now first printed from the original Ms., by Jane Austen, with a preface by G. K. Chesterton. N. Y., [1922].

the young novelist "seemed as if she were first taking note of all the faults to be avoided, and curiously considering how she ought not to write before she attempted to put forth her strength in the right direction."<sup>3</sup> There is imitation of predecessors and contemporaries aplenty in *Love and Freindship*, but it is not the sort of imitation usually found in the work of an author of sixteen. There is no burning of incense to literary idols, but there is a good deal of idol smashing. And the demolition, it must be acknowledged, is carried on with the hand of justice rather than of mercy.

This slender volume of 174 pages contains but one completed story, the title story, in fifteen letters; *Lesley Castle*, an unfinished novel in letters; *The History of England from the Reign of Henry the 4th to the death of Charles the 1st*: by a partial, prejudiced, and ignorant historian; *A Collection of Letters*: and a group of pieces which has been entitled *Scraps*, consisting of a fragment of a comedy, a half-told tale, and three letters.

The *Scraps* and *A Collection of Letters* are of interest, less as burlesque, for that is better in other parts of the volume, than as a revelation of the young author's literary background. These letters reflect acquaintance with epistolary novels—their titles and characters suggesting vaguely Mrs. Manly, Mrs. Rowe, and Mrs. Haywood—with sentimental comedy, with the seventeenth century character writing exemplified in the work of Hall, Overbury, Earle, Bretton, etc., and with books of travel descriptive of the British Isles. "At an early age she was enamoured of Gilpin and the picturesque," writes her brother, Henry.<sup>4</sup> William Gilpin, author of several volumes of travels in the romantic localities of Great Britain, was one of a number of well known tourists who slightly after the middle of the eighteenth century began through the publication of journals and guide books to make these long unappreciated regions fashionable. Allusions in *Pride and Prejudice*<sup>5</sup> and in several of the earlier stories to Gilpin's tours or to traveling in Wales and in the English Lake Country show Miss

<sup>3</sup> *A Memoir*, p. 46.

<sup>4</sup> *Personal Aspects of Jane Austen* by M. A. Austen-Leigh. N. Y., 1920, p. 29.

<sup>5</sup> *Pride and Prejudice*. Ginn and Co., [1917] pp. 163, 248, 250; *Love and Freindship* pp. 8, 44-45, 171.

Austen to have been fully aware of this popular interest. Her pleasure in books of this character, however, did not prevent her from detecting in them elements of extravagance and from holding them up to ridicule. "Fanny has taken many drawings of the country, which are very beautiful, though perhaps not such exact resemblances as might be wished, from their being taken as she ran along."<sup>6</sup>

These fragmentary pieces are of further interest in revealing here and there a half sketched character, a situation, or a name which was to hold a conspicuous place in the later novels. Just as *The Watsons*, as pointed out by J. E. Austen-Leigh<sup>7</sup> in the *Memoir*, furnishes a preliminary study for Mrs. Elton, so the third letter in this *Collection*, "From a Young Lady in Distressed Circumstances to her Freind," seems to portray in Lady Greville the ancestor of the officious Lady Catherine de Burgh. And the sketch entitled "The Female Philosopher" may not only point back to seventeenth century character writing, but find its ultimate expression in Mary Bennett. In two letters of sentiment "From a Young Lady Crossed in Love to her freind" occur the names of Crawford, Dashwood, and Willoughby, the plot if it may be so called, turning on the faithlessness of this Willoughby to the writer of the letter. It is interesting to find the name of Willoughby so early associated with the character of the gentleman rake who was to work such havoc in the heart of Marianne Dashwood. In still another letter, "From a Young Lady Very Much in Love to her Freind" is found the name of Musgrove.

*The History of England*, is merely the work of a normally clever child. It lacks the almost uncanny cleverness and sparkle of the story, *Love and Freindship*. When read after the little novel, it is disappointing, for the distinguishing feature of *The History of England* was not contributed by Jane but by Cassandra, and this is the illustrations. These little medallions in color, here for the first time brought to light, are attractively reproduced as end papers for the volume. They furnish delightful examples of satiric portraiture conceived and executed in a spirit not unworthy of Jane, herself. In this

<sup>6</sup> *Love and Freindship*, p. 172.

<sup>7</sup> *A Memoir*, p. 296. The character here referred to is Mrs. Robert Watson.

picture gallery royalty is shown subjected to much the same leveling process to which Thackeray was to treat his Queen Anne and "old Lewis the Fourteenth." For the most part, it has been divested of its purple and fine linen and forced to appear as mere mankind. The result is not always flattering. Edward IV might be taken for a pork butcher. Henry VII is Parsimony personified. Henry VIII, the most original of the group, owing to its utter repudiation of the Holbein tradition, is a gay Lothario, "his only merit," says the text, "being that he was not quite so bad as his daughter Elizabeth." The miniature of daughter Elizabeth for whom the artist has reserved her most exquisite animus, might equally well pass for that of Thackeray's Countess Gruffenough, for it is singularly anticipatory of his satiric manner.

These little cartoons lead one to wonder whether Cassandra's talent as a humorist has not been neglected beside that of her more brilliant sister, and whether Janes' own talent may not have received quickening through association with Cassandra. All the novelist's biographers like to dwell on the congeniality of the two sisters. They were inseparable companions from early childhood. The dénouement of the unfinished *Watsons*<sup>8</sup> was confided to Cassandra. It was she who was the recipient of the novelist's most personal letters. Such intimate association cannot be without significance. Cassandra's faculty for humorous and satiric observation of men and manners must have been very like Jane's own if we may judge by the extract from the following letter:

"This letter which I have this moment received from you," writes the younger to the elder sister, "has diverted me beyond moderation. I could die of laughter at it . . . You are indeed the finest comic writer of the present age."<sup>9</sup>

As Miss Austen's admiration of contemporary authors was directed almost entirely towards those who wrote in her own vein, it is highly probably that Cassandra's letter showed the same kind of sparkling wit that makes the novelist's own letters such pleasant reading. It is much to be regretted, therefore,

<sup>8</sup> *A Memoir*, p. 364.

<sup>9</sup> *Letters*, Winchester ed., vol. XI, p. 229.

that the published Austen letters should have to be confined almost exclusively to those of the novelist. Unfortunately Cassandra's letters to Jane, like the most personal of her sister's, were very likely destroyed by their author soon after Jane's death, for Cassandra seems not only to have had a strong distaste for publicity, but a very modest opinion of her own talents. She would doubtless have been amazed had she foreseen that her informal personal commentaries on her little world would have been eagerly welcomed by a later age. With no thought of disparaging such genius as Jane Austen's, in the light of this evidence, one cannot help indulging in the interesting speculation as to how much the novelist talked over with her sister the plots and characters of her stories, and whether some of these intimate revelations and discussions may not have helped to clarify situations and conceptions of personalities, and inspire some of the shrewd, incisive observations of human character. Is it extreme, then, to hazard the opinion that "the finest comic writer of the present age" may have stimulated the more gifted sister to some of her brilliant achievement?

Of the more important stories *Lesley Castle* ranks next in merit to *Love and Freindship*, though considerably below it. While containing some excellent satire, it is on the whole less amusing than the title story; the burlesque is more often forced, and the humor without point. In title and in description of locality, *Lesley Castle* is a very mild parody on Gothic romance. But the author's interest here lies rather in laughing at faults of technique and in holding the mirror up to sentimentalism. The best situation considerably toned down, was to furnish one of the chief motives of *Sense and Sensibility*. Practical-minded Charlotte Lutterell who, by the way, may well be the progenitor of Charlotte Lucas, writes to a friend that after baking, broiling, stewing, roasting, and what not by day and by night in preparation for her sister's wedding feast, she is thrown into consternation by the sudden advent of the bride-to-be into the store room, "her face as white as a whipt syllabub" bringing the news that Hervey, her betrothed, had been thrown from his horse, had fractured his skull, and was pro-

nounced by his surgeon to be in the most immanent danger. "‘Good God,’ (said I,) you don’t say so? Why what in the name of Heaven will become of all the Victuals!’" (p. 61).

Here the bride runs true to form by sinking lifeless upon the linen chest, a condition which is followed by restoration to consciousness, convulsions, insensibility again, ending with high delirium, the prospect of a decline, and the determination of the family to remove her to Bath, that eighteenth century panacea for most ills of heart and body. And through all this runs the constant refrain of Charlotte’s lamentations over the lost victuals. This little farce of Sense and Sensibility is in spite of some unevenness, very good fooling.

*Love and Freindship* exhibits nonsense still cleverer, better sustained. The burlesque is carried out with unflagging spirit from start to finish. The adventurous plot is rich in stock situations and characters reminiscent of picaresque and sentimental fiction.

Chance brings the hero to the home of the heroine. Mutual love at first sight leads at once to marriage, the ceremony being performed by the bride’s father, "who though he had never taken orders had been bred in the Church." Pursued by the hero’s father who has expressed strong disapproval of the match, the wedded pair seek asylum with friends of the hero. Augustus and Sophia are also victims of parental ire and are in consequence suffering from fast diminishing resources. Their financial burdens greatly increasing with the arrival of Edward and Laura, the hero and heroine, they are soon reduced to bare sentiment which an unenlightened society cruelly refuses to recognize as an adequate economic factor in their *ménage*. The beautiful Augustus is arrested for debt; Edward accompanies his friend. The bereaved wives, whose sensibilities are too exquisite to allow them to visit their husbands in Newgate, betake themselves as far as possible from the scene of distress. They go on a visit to a relative of Sophia’s in Scotland. In due time they arrive at Macdonald Hall, Laura on the way having recovered a hitherto unknown grandfather and several cousins whose identity is revealed to her through her sensibility.

At Macdonald Hall the two young ladies perform the signal service of assisting the daughter of the house to a matrimonial alliance of purely romantic character, thus saving her from the practical one she was about to contract. Their sojourn at Macdonald Hall, is however abruptly and unpleasantly terminated, through the discovery by their host of his daughter's elopement; which discovery is precipitated by an earlier one, to wit, Sophia's custom of majestically removing each day one or more bank notes from her relative's escritoire.

After an insulting, nay, barbarous dismissal, the unfortunate young ladies and their tender sensibilities set out to wander they know not whither in an unfriendly world. After a mile and a half of walking, while they rest their exhausted limbs beside a limpid stream and remark upon the eastern zephyr, the grandeur of the elms, and the azure of the heavens, they are startled by the sight of a phaeton overturning in the high-road near by. They arrive upon the scene only to discover that the occupants of the ill-fated vehicle are their own husbands now weltering in gore and the agonies of death.

From this distressing climax the dénouement follows rapidly. Laura goes mad, and Sophia falling into a galloping consumption contracted from constant swooning in the chilling damps of evening at the scene of the tragedy is carried off by this disease in a few days. Laura recovers her reason in time to receive Sophia's dying admonition to beware of fainting fits.

After attending to the last sad rites for her friend, she leaves the detested neighborhood before dawn and enters a passing stage coach. It is too dark to distinguish the number of her fellow-passengers, to say nothing of recognizing any of them. Giving herself up to sad reflections she is disturbed by the loud and repeated snores of one of the party. "What an illiterate villian must that man be (though I to myself). What a total want of delicate refinement must he have who can thus shock our sense by such a brutal noise! He must I am certain be capable of every bad action. There is no crime too black for such a character." (p. 41).

The light of morning slowly appearing discovers to the heroine the knightly features of her father-in-law. In fact,



daylight discovers all the other occupants of the coach to be her inlaws, her friends and her relatives; they overflow on to the box and into the basket. By this brilliant coup the actors in toto are gathered for the final curtain. And after each is neatly disposed of, for even the inexperience of sixteen leaves no loose ends dangling, the heroine retires to a romantic village in the highlands of Scotland where uninterrupted by unmeaning visits she can indulge in a melancholy solitude and unceasing lamentations for the death of her parents, her husband, and her friends.

Thus in the space of fifty pages this little story coolly surveys the fictional product of the age and with astonishing deftness tells off its chief vices and exposes them to a ridicule, amiable, to be sure, but always judicial.

An open thrust at Richardson's too often ill concealed consciousness of the responsibilities entailed by the epistolary method may be detected in the opening letter: the elaborate emphasis placed upon the motive for writing: "How often in answer to my repeated intreaties that you would give my Daughter a regular detail of the Misfortunes and Adventures of your Life," etc. This recalls at once Miss Howe's request for a meticulous account of the circumstances leading to Clarissa's rupture with her family. Again, the burden of self-consciousness imposed upon a character by this method is absurdly illustrated when Laura is driven to describe her own appearance in the process of going mad: "*My greif was the more audible. My Voice faltered, My Eyes assumed a vacant stare, my Face became as pale as Death, and my senses were considerably impaired.*" (p. 37). There is a mild reflection of the romance of roguery in the adventurous career of Laura and Sophia, in the idle curiosity of Laura who listens at keyholes, in the inability of Sophia and also of Augustus to distinguish, as Fielding has put it, between *meum* and *tuum*. This trio illustrates also the discrepancy between noble sentiment and ignoble conduct. "They, Exalted Creatures! scorned to reflect a moment on their pecuniary Distresses and would have blushed at the idea of paying their Debts." (p. 19). Laura declares that her mind is a rendezvous of every good quality and of every noble sentiment, but she listens at doors and

assists in purloining bank notes. These instances recall Dryden's brilliant technique in satiric portraiture: the building up of a reputation in one line or half line to blast it in the next.

As a satire on sentimental romance *Love and Freindship*, had it been published at the time of composition, would have been sufficient to establish its author's attitude towards this genre once and for all. *Sense and Sensibility* might have remained unwritten.

Goldwin Smith,<sup>10</sup> writing of Miss Austen in 1890, says that there is barely a trace of her French reading in her works, that Voltaire and Rousseau were not likely to find their way to the shelves of an English parsonage. Subsequent biographical study, however, has disclosed the fact that Rousseau, at least, may have been known to the novelist at an early age. The Austen-Leighs state<sup>11</sup> that by 1789 Jane's favorite brother, the brilliant Henry, was at Oxford, contributing to *The Loiterer* a paper on the sentimental school of Rousseau, considering "how far the indulgence of the above named sentiments affects the immediate happiness or misery of human life." In 1789 Jane was fourteen and if capable of producing *Love and Freindship* at sixteen, must have been able to appreciate family discussion of Henry's paper, if not to talk of it with Henry himself. If there is barely a trace of Rousseau in the work known to the public in 1890, it may be said that *Love and Freindship* is an exploitation of his fundamental doctrine concerning the importance of feeling in its relation to conduct. Primary emotions, instinctive judgments are a more trustworthy basis for action, than are reflection, caution and advice.

In *Love and Freindship*, feeling is the acknowledged guide to conduct; action is always impulsive. At the sudden entrance of the hero, a young man entirely unknown to the heroine, she says: "My natural sensibility had already been greatly affected by the sufferings of the unfortunate stranger and no sooner did I first behold him than I felt that on him the happiness or Misery of my future Life must depend." (p. 7). Again, she writes: "Our attention was attracted by the Entrance of a

<sup>10</sup> *Life of Jane Austen*. London, 1890, p. 22.

<sup>11</sup> *Jane Austen: her life and letters, a family record* by William Austen-Leigh and Richard Arthur Austen-Leigh. London, 1913, p. 48.

coroneted Coach and 4 into the Inn-yard. A Gentleman considerably advanced in years, descended from it. At his first Appearance my Sensibility was wonderfully affected and e'er I had gazed at him a 2d time, an instinctive sympathy whispered to my Heart, that he was my Grandfather." (p. 23). In both instances the action that follows is based on this intuitive judgment. Feeling is prophetic. Laura's instinctive sympathy whispers to her that Sophias' illness will be fatal. Feeling is the key to instant and inviolable friendship. Laura writes of her first meeting with Sophia: "A soft languor overspread her lovely features . . . It was the Charectarestic of her mind. She was all sensibility and Feeling. We flew into each others arms and having exchanged vows of mutual Freindship for the rest of our Lives, instantly unfolded to each other the inmost secrets of our Hearts." (p. 15). Feeling is exclusive and rich in resources. Augustus and Sophia had upon their first entrance into the neighborhood taken due care to inform the surrounding families that their happiness centered wholly in themselves; they wished for no other society. Feeling is fed by the sight of feeling until it becomes too poignant to be endured and ends in unconsciousness. At the affecting meeting of Augustus and Edward, Laura and Sophia faint alternately upon a sofa. A susceptible heart makes a woman an ornament to human nature. It gives her a soul above victuals and drink. A hero with a soul feeds on the *Sorrows of Werther*.<sup>12</sup> If at the sight of love the woman of sensibility is driven to swooning, at the sight of death she is driven to madness. Sighs, tears, fainting fits are the commonest occurences in life. In fact, no sign that would bespeak delicate sensibility is absent.

If Miss Austen were unacquainted at this age with the doctrines of Rousseau at first hand, she may have acquired a knowledge of them through the medium of English educational and sentimental fiction, in the work of such writers at Brooke, Mackenzie, and Day. The burlesque at times is very appropriate to incidents in *The Man of Feeling* (1771). Or, acquaintance may have come through one of Rousseau's most active

<sup>12</sup> If Miss Austen at the age of sixteen was acquainted with this celebrated piece of romantic fiction, it shows that no very strict censorship could have been exercised over her youthful reading. See p. 3 of this study.

French disciples, Madame de Genlis, to whose work the novelist makes several references in the letters of her mature years.<sup>13</sup> But in view of the congeniality of the Austen family, their fondness for social and intellectual intercourse with each other, it does not seem unreasonable to assume that Jane became imbued with doctrines of Rousseau about the time of the appearance of Henry's paper in *The Loiterer* and detecting in them material for satire, turned them to her own account in *Love and Freindship*.

As one turns the pages of this astonishing little book, so many features crowd forward for notice that it is difficult to make a selection. Characters glide in and out of the action with the sublime irresponsibility of the figures in a dream. The glooms of nature are brought into perfect harmony with the melancholy soul of the hero, indulging his mood in solitary rambles. There is elevated diction, swelling to bombast in impassioned passages. There is magnificent disregard of parental authority in the desire for supreme expression of the inexplicable ego. There are intimate confessions of the *Wanderjahre* of young Rousseaus and Werthers, with intent to shock the reader. With the exception of the element of horror, few of the plague spots of sentimental romance have been left uncovered.

Chesterton, in the introduction, commenting on features in this story which anticipate the later novels, finds in the father's behavior in the following incident a foreshadowing of a well-known character in *Pride and Prejudice*.

The heroine with her father and mother "arranged in social converse" round the fireside in their rustic cot, are astonished by a violent knocking at the door.

"My Father started—'What noise is that,' (said he.) 'It sounds like a loud rapping at the door'—(replied my Mother.) 'It does indeed' (cried I.) 'I am of your opinion; (said my Father) it certainly does appear to preceed from some uncommon violence exerted against our unoffending door.' 'Yes (exclaimed I) I cannot help thinking that it must be somebody who knocks for admittance.'

<sup>13</sup> *Life and Letters*, W. and R. A. Austen-Leigh, pp. 198, 365; *Emma*, Everyman's Lib., p. 375.

'That is another point (replied he;) We must not pretent to determine on what motive the person may knock—tho' that some one *does* rap at the door I am partly convinced.'

"Here, a 2d tremendous rap interrupted my Father in his speech, and somewhat alarmed my mother and me.

'Had we not better go and see who it is?' (said she) the servants are out.' 'I think we had) (replied I). 'Certainly, (added my Father) by all means.' 'Shall we go now?' (said my Mother). 'The sooner the better (answered he). 'Oh! let no time be lost.' (cried I).

"A third more violent Rap than ever again assaulted our ears. 'I am certain there is someone knocking at the Door.' (said my Mother). 'I think there must be,' (replied my Father) 'I fancy the servants are returned; (said I) I think I hear Mary going to the Door.' 'I'm glad of it (cried my Father) for I long to know who it is.' " (pp. 5-6).

Chesterton hears in "the aggravating leisure and lucidity" of this dialogue the unmistakable voice of Mr. Bennett. Perhaps, but is it not rather the unmistakable voice of the Rev. Lawrence Sterne? The imitation is wisely restrained, for in the procrastination of action by argument, discussion, interpolation and digression Sterne cannot be outdone. And yet the imitation is there; the similarity extends even to incident.

"—I wonder what's all that noise, and running backwards and forwards for, above stairs, quoth my father, addressing himself after an hour and a half's silence, to my uncle Toby,—who, you must know, was sitting on the opposite side of the fire, smoking his social pipe all the time, in mute contemplation of a new pair of black plush-breeches which he had got on:—What can they be doing, brother? quoth my father,—we can scarce hear ourselves talk.

"I think, replied my uncle Toby, taking his pipe from his mouth, and striking the head of it two or three times upon the nail of his left thumb as he began his sentence,—I think, says he:—But to enter rightly into my uncle Toby's sentiments upon this matter, you must be made to enter first a little into his character, the outlines of which I shall just give you, and then the dialogue between him and my father will go on as well again." (Bk. I, Chap. XXI).

Hereupon follows a digression of twenty-five pages comprising the last five chapters of Book I and the first five chapters of Book II, the dialogue being picked up at the beginning of Chapter VI.

"—What can they be doing, brother? said my father.—I think, replied my uncle Toby,—taking, as I told you, his pipe from his mouth, and striking the ashes out of it as he began his sentence;—I think, replied he,—it would not be amiss brother, if we rung the bell."

Here is the same retardation of action when the necessity for action is immanent; the same disinclination to act on the part of those most eager to have their curiosity satisfied; the same irresponsibility for action and the disposition to wait for the servants to solve the mystery. Thus the humor, or irritation, in both situations proceeds from an identical source.

There is an instance where Mr. Bennett withholds a certain piece of information from his family until he has teased them to his satisfaction, but his manner is very different from this as any one can see who will read *Pride and Prejudice*, chapter II.

The satiric tone of the humor in *Love and Freindship* is singularly mature. There is apparent here something of the unexpectedness, the precision, the shrewd incisiveness of the later humor.

"The noble Youth informed us that his name was Lindsay—for particular reasons, however, I shall conceal it under that of Talbot." (p. 7).

"She was a Widow and had only one Daughter, who was just then seventeen—One of the best of ages; but alas! she was very plain and her name was Bridget . . . Nothing therefore could be expected from her—she could not be supposed to possess either exalted Ideas, Delicate Feelings, or refined Sensibilities—She was nothing more than a mere good-tempered, civil and obliging young woman; as such we could scarcely dislike her—she was only an Object of Contempt." (p. 38).

As Sophia and Laura see the phateon overturn, while they are hastening to the field of action, the latter exclaims:

"What an ample subject for reflection on the uncertain Enjoyments of this world, would not that Phaeton and the Life of Cardinal Wolsey afford a thinking Mind!" (p. 35).

And a few minutes later, this thinking mind having lost its balance is itself affording an illustration of the above sentiment:

"Talk not to me of Phaetons (said I, raving in a frantic, incoherent manner)—Give me a violin—I'll play to him and soothe him in his melancholy Hours—Beware ye gentle Nymphs of Cupid's Thunderbolts, avoid the piercing shafts of Jupiter—Look at that grove of Firs—I see a Leg of Mutton—They told me Edward was not Dead; but they deceived me.—They took him for a cucumber'." (p. 37).

It is all so neat, so taut, so discriminating. It will bear rereading, that certain test of genuine humor. One stands almost in awe before humor such as this at sixteen. In the light of this, the humor of *Pride and Prejudice* and of *Emma* is inevitable.

In literary quality *Love and Freindship* is superior to most of the serious novels of the day which Miss Austen was later to laugh at in her mature novels and letters. As burlesque it should rank with the best minor burlesques of the period, one of which preceded it, the other of which followed: Mrs. Lennox's *Female Quixote* (1752) and *The Heroine; or the Adventures of Cherubina* (1813) by Eaton Stannard Barrett which has received tardy recognition in our own time through a reprint with an introduction by the late Sir Walter Raleigh (1909). These books, the work of experienced writers, are naturally more pretentious than *Love and Freindship*; their outlines are much more completely filled in. Miss Austen's story is thin; it is only an earnest of the possibilities of such a framework, but in quality it is no mean rival.

The satiric scope of *Love and Freindship* recalls Colley Cibber's outraged protest against the young Fielding. "Religion, Laws, Government, Priests, Judges, Ministers were all laid flat at the feet of this Herculean Satyrst, this Drawcansir of wit that spared neither friend nor foe."<sup>14</sup> Miss Austen though she confined her ridicule to the world of literature shows

<sup>14</sup> *An Apology for the Life of Mr. Colley Cibber*. . . . written by himself. Ed., R. W. Lowe, London, 1889, vol. I, p. 287.

that she too has observed widely. There is present here the same disposition to spare nothing that she found suitable for laughter. This trait is evident also, in the first mature novels where the satire moving away from burlesque becomes more creative and broadens to include types of character from actual life: *Pride and Prejudice*, *Mansfield Park*, and *Emma*. In the early satire of Fielding and Miss Austen there is beneath its youthful exuberance a certain hardness, due to an exquisite faculty for detecting the false. Both as they grew older became not less critical of human deficiencies, but more tolerant, and hence more tender. The Fielding of *Amelia* is wiser and gentler than the Fielding who scared Colley Cibber into his denunciatory broadside. The Jane Austen of *Persuasion* is mellower than the Jane Austen of *Love and Freindship*, or even of *Pride and Prejudice*.<sup>15</sup>

This little book invites one into Miss Austen's mental workshop, a spot which to judge from her habit of surreptitious composition she would have preferred to keep inviolate from the public. Here are evidences of literary background that connect her with a great part of the popular fiction of her time, as well as with other forms of writing. It establishes her as a voracious reader of novels from early childhood, and as a character even then of strong independence in her wholesome reaction against worthless fiction.

*Love and Freindship* reveals Miss Austen's work to be all of a piece. The name of Musgrove, borne by a sentimental correspondent in the juvenile volume and by a prominent family in *Persuasion*, links her last fiction with her first. If the *Watsons* fragment is included in these youthful studies, there is not a single one of the six mature novels whose beginnings, if only minutely, cannot be detected here, in a genre, a situation, a character, or a mere name. From the time of her first creative efforts her mind must have been teeming with story material. She must have thought about her characters for years before

<sup>15</sup> L. P. Smith, "On Rereading Jane Austen" in the *Literary Review of The New York Evening Post*, March 8, 1924 insists, and I think justly, on the difference in tone between the three earlier and the three later novels, separated in time of composition by about eleven years. Even so, there is discernible much more of hardness and caricature in *Love and Freindship* than in *Pride and Prejudice*; the difference is almost as marked as between *Pride and Prejudice* and the three later novels.



she committed them finally to paper. These studies explain the forethought, the loving care expended upon the later novels. They show the beginnings of that artistic conscience which stands almost unrivaled in the range of English fiction. Infinite capacity for taking pains may not be all of genius, but it accounts for at least one element in the genius of Jane Austen.

## Mikhail Yurevich Lermontov

CLARENCE A. MANNING  
Columbia University

Transplant Roderick Dhu from his native Highlands to the court of Petersburg, and think of the consequences. Imagine for an instant the proud clansman, willing to live the life of an outlaw rather than forgive a blow or make peace with an enemy, living in a court where an autocrat rules and where intrigue and treachery abound. Think of a man who was born for freedom living where freedom is not even existent, not even as a concept, and what would be the result? Tragedy. No other outcome is possible.

In this comparison we have the life of Lermontov, next to Pushkin the greatest of all Russian poets. No poet as he has so loved liberty, so felt the thrill of independence, been so willing to pay the price; and yet he sought the liberty of the clan chief, of the individual; and as he battled with society and the world, it was for himself and his kind that he fought, and not for humanity.

It is not so strange to compare Lermontov with the Scotch clansman. In the beginning of the seventeenth century a Scotch soldier of fortune, George Learmonth, passed from Poland into Russia and entered the service of the tsars. In the course of generations the family became russified, but they never forgot their Scotch origin, and the story of the border raids and of the proud independence of their ancestors was passed down from generation to generation. This was his father's pride and delight and it was all that he had to give his young son, Mikhail Yurevich; for George Lermontov had married the daughter of a Russian family which traced its descent to the lords of Constantinople, and the mother-in-law never wearied of venting on all her friends the true greatness of the Byzantine ancestors.

It was in this atmosphere that Mikhail Yurevich Lermontov was born, October 3, 1814. When he was but three years old, his mother died and his father saw himself compelled to leave the boy with the grandmother, so that he would be able to

receive the best education of the time. His boyhood passed amid all the luxury of the early nineteenth century; but of all the impressions of his surroundings, none were so powerful as the majesty of the Caucasus, where his grandmother took him when he was still very young.

At a very early age he began to write poetry and by the time that he was fifteen he was already producing meritorious work. Already he had passed under the influence of Byron and was dreaming of being a stranger persecuted by the world, alien to happiness, and he attempted to act as befitted one who was fated to live apart from, and superior to, humanity.

He went to the University of Moscow in 1830 but he left there two years later as a result of personal unpleasantness with the professors, who were displeased at his haughty demeanor. Petersburg University refused to admit him on his own terms and he entered the Officers' School. Here he mixed with a gay and brilliant society, which he sought to outshine in its cynicism and frivolity. On his graduation in 1834, he became one of the most dashing young officers of the younger set of the capital. His grandmother gave him a most liberal allowance and he used it to the full.

Life was one series of affairs, of flirtations and disenchantments, until the death of the poet Pushkin in a duel in 1837. Amid the excitement which this caused, Lermontov crashed into prominence with a poem denouncing in the most scathing terms the murderer, society, the world, "And you, haughty descendants of sires renowned for unexampled baseness . . . you will never wipe away with your black blood the righteous blood of the poet!"

The challenge was too open. Even his grandmother's social prestige could not wholly save him, and Lermontov was summarily ordered to the Caucasus to serve in one of the regiments engaged against the mountaineers. To the poet the sentence was not unwelcome. It carried him back to the scenes of his childhood and gave him an opportunity to distinguish himself in a new field. The next year the sentence was revoked and Lermontov, soberer and more settled, came back to the capital, but not for long. His imperious disposition could not stand

the artificial life of the court. Once again he was a participant in a duel and once again he was sent to the Caucasus. This was the last time. He served in the mountains for three years (1838-1841) and again his passion broke all bounds. He insulted a pompous officer and in the duel which followed, he was killed, July 15, 1841.

Dead at the age of twenty-seven and already recognized as one of the foremost poets of his country! His was a tumultuous life, a life of action and of storms; and in his death he had the same smile on his lips and the same bitterness in his heart which had marked him all through life. Amid the commonplace and humdrum lives of most of the Russian literary men, Lermontov moved like a meteor, a riddle to his contemporaries, an object of contempt to many, of admiration to more.

His life was spent on one theme—the Demon. He commenced this tale of a lost angel at the age of fifteen, and he had planned another version at the time of his death; for after all is said, the Demon is in many respects nothing more nor less than Lermontov himself, with his titanic passions reproduced on an even more titanic scale. The Demon had been originally a mere sketch with the scene in Spain, but each reworking of the legend added more local color to the scene. It was transferred to the Caucasus and there it remained amid the mountains that Lermontov loved so well. What is the Demon and what is his object? He is the spirit of denial and of banishment:

And as he ruled the worthless earth  
He evil sowed without delight  
And never to his powerful art  
Did foeman dare himself oppose—  
And he was bored by wrong and sin.

Then he catches sight of Tamara, the daughter of a mountain chief. A new spirit moves in his veins; and when the girl's fiancé is killed in an ambush the Demon begins to tempt her and to promise her rewards of every kind. To escape temptation, the girl retires to a convent, but even here the Demon follows her. He hopes by her love to win back heaven, to recover all that he had lost. He hopes again to be as he was when, a bright Cherubim, he exchanged friendly greetings with the fly-

ing comets, and when he was the proud firstling of creation. He enters the convent. Haughty as ever he declares to the astonished Tamara, "I am the foe of heaven, the evil of nature, and you see I am at your feet." He swears by all things in heaven and hell, on earth and sea, by goodness and by evil, by God and her to reform, but it is too much. One kiss kills her and an angel carries her soul to heaven. In vain the Demon interferes; in vain he claims that she cannot enter, that she must be his. All in vain and

The conquered Demon cursed in vain  
The foolish dream which he had served.  
With unbent pride he once again  
Was forced to stay alone and reign  
Without repose, bereft of love.

Such is the plot. Yet is the Demon really evil? No! He is bored, inexcusably, insufferably bored, a lonesome figure thirsting only for love and for peace, for some ideal which he honestly seeks in Tamara; and yet he is as inevitably disappointed. It is this sad seeking for a lost something which is the cause of all his actions, of his all-embracing oaths; but there is no hope. He is more than Mephistopheles. He is Faust and Mephistopheles in one, all-powerful and yet all-seeking, cynical and credulous and aflame with love.

And the background of the poem? The lofty crags, the mist-filled valleys, the majestic spaces of the snow-capped Caucasus. It is a poem of the heights, of the towering summits, and the mighty grandeur of the scenery supplies a worthy setting for the action.

The Demon belongs with *Paradise Lost* and *Faust* to the number of the world's great representations of fallen spirits, but the general weakness of the hero is that of Lermontov himself. In his minor poems he analyzes these moods. Now he is a Byron with a Russian soul, now some other stranger destined to an early death; and he is Pechorin.

*Pechorin, the Hero of our Times!* Men read this novel and criticized it. They tried to find in it sketches of Lermontov himself, of his companions and friends. The poet disclaimed these high intentions. He aimed (so he announced in

an introduction) merely to point out the disease of his day, and he had no program for relieving it. Grigory Aleksandrovich Pechorin is a young officer, and the book is a collection of sketches representing him at different stages in his career. First as a boy, he had loved a girl Vyera, but he wanted to be "smart;" and so when he came away to school, he followed the custom of the age and did not write her. She married another man, Count Ligovskoy. It was an unhappy, loveless match, and the bitterness was magnified when Pechorin returned for a visit. Meanwhile he, like Lermontov, moves around the gay world, now flirting desperately and again treating the same girl with the most cynical indifference, making her an object of ridicule. Of course it is not noble; it is merely fashionable.

The other sketches are in the Caucasus. Pechorin tires of the gay world and goes down to serve in a regiment on the frontier. The only other officer at the post is Maksim Maksimich, a stern but appealing old soldier. He had to stay there, for his army salary would not allow him to live in the capital; and so he remains on the frontier and consoles himself that all the evil in the world is caused by drink. He loves Pechorin. When he meets him later, for the first time in his life he postpones a government duty to greet an old friend and Pechorin replies with a cool and formal salutation and the remark that he has no time to stop and talk. The insolence and coolness of the younger man is heartbreaking, but of course Pechorin is a pillar of society.

Yet does it pay him? Lermontov unhesitatingly answers in the negative. He cannot appreciate the love of a woman of the world. How about a savage? And so he arranges with young Azamat to steal his sister Bela and bring her to the fortress in exchange for a wonderful horse which can be stolen from a brigand. Old Maksim Maksimich protests, but Pechorin with brazen effrontery again has his own way and keeps the girl. Her love is no better. So long as she resists, Pechorin is a willing slave; but when she finally does love him, it brings to him merely boredom, and he is not really sorry when the bandit Kazbich murders her. It merely frees him from a difficult situation. Princess Mary at a fashionable watering place

means no more to him. He wins her away from a young ensign Grushnitsky (who really loves her) and then kills him in a duel. That done, his desire is satisfied. Yet beneath it all Pechorin still loves Vyera, since widowed and then married again to another impossible man. This seems to be the only bright spot in his life, and his loyalty to an impossible ideal is in strong contrast to the scorn and contempt which he has for all else in the world. Is it a reflection of Lermontov's own hopeless affection for a cousin, Barbara Lopukhina, like Vyera, unhappily married to another? So passes Pechorin, sad at heart but with a smiling face, cynical and yet attractive, a commentary on many butterfly lives.

When we leave characters of the type of Pechorin and come back to poetry, Lermontov gives us a wide variety. Look at his historical ballad, the *Song of the Tsar Ivan Vasilyevich, the young oprichnik and the bold merchant Kalashnikov*. A formidable title, but back of it is a tale of Ivan the Terrible and it sets forth in plain, blunt language the weird rule of that monarch. The dread tsar favors the suit of his oprichnik who does not tell him that he is seeking the love of a married woman. The husband learning of the insult meets and kills the offender in a boxing match on the banks of Moscow-River. Ivan in anger inquires why the match had a fatal ending; and when the young man says that he did it deliberately, Ivan orders him to be beheaded. But for his frankness the tsar will not withhold his mercy from the family. So he bestows on the brothers of the deceased freedom from taxes, and other mercies.

It is truly Ivanesque, this mixture of ferocity and liberality, this fondness for blood and this willingness to enrich. The reader will call it irony on the part of the author, but that is not true. All the historical ballads speak in the same manner of the Terrible Tsar, and Lermontov has caught well the spirit and the peculiarities of the past. He never leaves the antique type from his introduction to his conclusion:

Glory to the bearded boyar!  
Glory to his lady fair!  
Glory to all Christian people!

Yet it is in the poems dealing with the Caucasus that the real greatness of Lermontov is revealed. The proud and haughty spirit can appreciate and sympathize with the eaglets of the hoary Caucasus, those men of whom he sings:

Wild are the tribes of these mountains.  
Their God is freedom and their law is war.

The *Fugitive* shows this spirit. A poor boy on his first foray flees from a field on which his father and his brothers have fallen in battle against the Russians. He goes home, flees by secret paths and hopes for a kindly welcome. But he has forgotten the law of the mountains—to avenge his kinsmen or to die with them. His friends, his beloved, even his aged mother all turn him away in contempt. Let him live in shame if he cannot die with honor! Suicide is his only hope and even then no one has pity on the corpse: it is left for the dogs. A savage judgment, but Islam and the mountains know no mercy.

Liberty and the glory of the mountains, these are the life of the orphan in *Mtsyri*. It is a sad and simple tale. A mountain boy taken prisoner while a mere child is brought up in a monastery. His spirit is unbroken and he vanishes. A few days later he is found dying nearby. The flesh was weak. Now in his confession he tells an aged monk his hopes and fears, his sorrows and his dreams. And why should he not flee?

For I am young, and dost thou know  
The dreams of stormy youth?  
Didst thou not know or hast forgot  
The way to hate, the way to love.  
And how thy heart beat stronger too  
When thou caughtst sight of sun and fields  
From some high corner tower  
Where blows the gale and where at times  
Hid deep within a wall's recess,  
The wandering child of unknown lands,  
The young dove sits and cowers  
To miss the storm, the raging winds.  
That beauteous world may die for you  
For thou art weak and gray, and too  
Thou hast renounced desires here.  
Why not, old Man? Thou once didst live!  
Thou hast some things thou canst forget.  
Thou hast lived once—and I would live!



That is the spirit of the mountaineer; and so in the storm, while the monks crouched in terror by the altar, the boy ran away. What a blessing to be free! What wonder to be out in the gale and in the thunder! It was life, life! With high spirits the boy started off to seek his native mountains, the Caucasus! But it was too late. He was no more the proud and fearless wanderer. He feared pursuit. He feared to approach the haunts of men. He feared to defy the forces of nature. Worn and weary, spent and starving, he lost his way and came back to his prison. Death alone can be his portion and his saviour. He has but one last request:

And when you see my life doth ebb,  
And that will not be long, I know,  
Then order them to carry me  
Into our garden where there bloom  
The two acacia bushes white.  
The grass between them is so thick,  
The stirring air is sweet to smell,  
And so surpassing clear and gold  
The sunlight plays upon the leaves.  
There order them to lay me down  
And for the last and final time  
I shall drink in the beauteous day  
And there the Caucasus I'll see!  
Perchance from off its snowy heights  
It will send me a fond farewell,  
Some cooling breeze from its high peaks,  
And some faint sound will waft to me  
From out my distant native land.  
And I will think that some dear friend  
Or brother, bending at my side,  
Will wipe away with tender hand  
The heavy sweat of chilling death  
And he will whisper half aloud  
About my own beloved land  
And with that thought I'll fall asleep,  
And no one, no one will I curse!

In the whole field of Russian literature there is no appeal more touching, no attachment to a home more tender than this last plea of the poor orphan dying alone amid strangers far from his native mountains. With all of its humanitarianism,

its human sympathy, it can offer little to compare with these lines of the Russian officer, the proud and impetuous, cynical and bitter man of the world, because there were few others who knew how to sympathize honestly and sincerely with the wild and unrestrained mountaineer. Lermontov fought him, but he knew how to appreciate him; he knew his good points, his proud and dauntless courage; and it is not merely the personal plea of a lover of the mountains but the frank and honest recognition of the sincerity and feelings of an enemy.

If it be true, as was said sneeringly by one Russian critic, that Lermontov worshipped physical force because of a lack of intellectual development, just as most of his contemporaries did, then we can only say on reading his poems of liberty that the world has lost because it did not stop on the same plane of development.

The well-known *Cossack Cradle Song*, which has been set to music and has become a national folk song in Russia, as many of Heine's have in Germany, is another beautiful expression of this same type of human being, the man of action and of storms; and the aspirations of the mother, her hope that the child will become a brave warrior, contrast strangely with the soft refrain, *Bayushki, Bayu*.

Yet not all of Lermontov's poetry deals with this side of life. There was in him a vein of mysticism, of sincere faith as in the well-known poem, *The Angel*.

#### THE ANGEL

An angel flies through the midnight sky  
And softly his voice floats by.  
The moon and the stars mark his wonderful song  
And the clouds slowly drifting along.

He sang of the blessing of each sinless soul  
In heaven, its glorious goal.  
He sang of the powerful Lord and his praise  
Was true and unfeigned always.

And in his strong arms a young spirit there lay  
Beginning earth's sorrowful day.  
The soul of the child kept the sound of that song  
Unspoken but marvellous strong.

Though long in the world it was tortured and sad  
And many strange longings it had,  
It ne'er could forget 'mid the earth's mournful strain  
The sweetness of heaven's refrain.

Perhaps if Lermontov had lived, these strains of his poetry would have grown to surpass the more unpleasant notes of the earlier days. Critics and friends who met him on his last visit to Petersburg remarked on the change in his manner. He was gaining something from his life in the open, something which he had missed in the hectic days of his social whirl in the capital. "The poetry of Lermontov, freeing itself from disillusionment inspired by the life of a worldly society, in the last stage of its development approached this national-religious mood and its sadness began to acquire the shadow of poetic resignation, became the artistic expression of that prayer which serves as the basis of the Russian religious temperament, Thy will be done!" (Durylin, Lermontov, *Lyric Poems*, p. 23.)

Dead at twenty-seven! Hardly had Lermontov begun to find himself and to recover from the most violent stages of his revolt against the universe when he was struck down. We can merely speculate on what his later career might have been. At twenty-seven he was the greatest poet of his country next to Pushkin, and he was a man of tremendous power and personality. He was the first man to bring into Russian literature the problem of evil, the first to grasp the deep problems of the soul, that sphere in which Russian literature was to excel; and yet he was not easy to understand.

With his hand against society, a tempestuous storm-tossed poet, Lermontov flashed across the Russian sky, and like the lightning he vanished almost as soon as he appeared. Heroic and petty, consistent and inconsistent, Lermontov was a man who might have swept across Europe with Attila. He might have turned into one of the fiery monks who forced society to see its emptiness. He might have been one of a number of personalities had he lived longer and played his part to the end. But fate willed otherwise, and if we would sum up Lermontov in his love of freedom, his boldness and his independence, his successes and his failures, we can think of no better

example than that which we cited in the beginning, and turn to his Scotch ancestry, which he never forgot, and call him the Roderick Dhu of Russia with his bold threat,

He rights such wrong where it were given  
E'en 'twere it in the court of heaven.

It was no mere pose but the very nature of Lermontov's being, and for this reason the lesser critics who came after, who kept their eye on the people and reform, could not but criticize this wandering figure who came they knew not whence and passed as suddenly as he came. Yet with him died for nearly a half century poetry in Russia.

## Constitutional Progress and the Struggle for Democracy in South Carolina Following the Revolution

D. HUGER BACOT  
Alabama Technical Institute

An interesting picture of the conservatism of the slave-owners of the old South and of their ideal of popular government may be secured by studying the constitutional development of South Carolina in the late eighteenth century and the struggle of her interior, with its few slaves, for equality of representation with the tidewater black belt. At the start we find a liberal suffrage requirement, but high property qualifications for officeholding, which restricted leadership to the planter class, and a distribution of representation which gave control of the state Assembly to the low country, with its small white population, large number of slaves, and valuable landed property. The democratic interior, with few slaves, large white population, and cheaper lands, had little influence on the state government, but kept demanding more representation and more democracy to secure equality with the tidewater plantation belt. Here we find the middle country, stretching from the flooded swampy tidewater region to the fall line of the rivers, and the hilly red-clay piedmont, extending back to the Appalachian mountain system, joining forces against the aristocratic plantation low country. The result was the establishment of a sort of "limited democracy," very different from anything to be met with in present day America. It must be remembered that, while this struggle was in progress, slavery and the plantation system were gradually pushing into the interior of the state with the extension of cotton culture. Thus the ideals of the low country were being slowly carried into the interior.

According to the constitution of 1778, legislative authority was vested in a General Assembly, consisting of a Senate and a House of Representatives. The Assembly was to elect for two-year terms a governor, a lieutenant governor, and a privy council. A residence in the state of ten years was required of

the governor and of the lieutenant governor. One of five years was required of members of the privy council. Each of these officials must possess a settled plantation or freehold of a value of £10,000 clear of debt, and must also be a Protestant in religion. Each member of the Senate was to be a Protestant and was to have a settled plantation or freehold in his parish or district worth £2,000 and clear of debt. If he was a non-resident, it must be worth £7,000. An elector must be a free white man, twenty-one years of age, resident in the state for one year, and possessing a freehold of at least fifty acres of land, or a town lot, held for six months before the election, or else be taxable in a sum equal to the tax on fifty acres of land. Also he must acknowledge "the being of a God" and believe "in a future state of rewards and punishment." Members of the House were to be Protestants and were to have resided in the state three years before their election. If residents of the parishes or districts from which elected, they were to own property "the same as mentioned in the election act, and construed to mean clear of debt." If non-residents, they were to own in such districts or parishes settled freeholds clear of debt of a value of £3,500 each.<sup>1</sup> I presume that the "election act" above named was that of 1759, according to which a representative was to own an estate of 500 acres and twenty slaves or property worth £1,000 proclamation money clear of debt.<sup>2</sup> Ramsay tells us that the chief difficulty encountered under this plan was the great expense incurred in supporting a very large number of representatives in the Assembly.<sup>3</sup> There was a total of twenty-nine senators and 202 members of the House. Senators were to be chosen annually and representatives every two years.<sup>4</sup> The constitution of 1778 remained in operation for twelve years.

In 1790 a new constitution was framed and ratified, which contained several changes from its predecessor. These were in the direction of democracy and made concessions to the up country. Also membership in the Assembly was reduced. A

<sup>1</sup> Cooper, *Statutes of South Carolina*, I, pp. 138-141.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, IV, p. 98.

<sup>3</sup> Ramsay, *History of South Carolina*, II, p. 138.

<sup>4</sup> Cooper, *Statutes of South Carolina*, I, pp. 139 and 140.

governor and a lieutenant governor were to be chosen by the Senate and the House jointly for terms of two years each. The qualifications for each of these officials were to be an age of thirty years, citizenship and residence in the state for ten years, and possession of a settled estate of a value of £1500 clear of debt.<sup>5</sup> State senators must be free white men thirty years of age and citizens and residents of the state for five years before their election. If residents of their election districts, they must possess settled freehold estates clear of debt valued at £300 each. If non-residents, they must possess in the districts from which they were elected similar estates valued at £1000 each. Membership in the House was restricted to free white men, twenty-one years of age, and citizens and residents of the state for three years before their elections. Each member, if a resident of the district from which elected, was to have a settled freehold estate of 500 acres of land and ten negroes in his own right clear of debt, or real estate of a value of £150. If a nonresident of the district, he must own in it a freehold estate of a value of £500 clear of debt. Senators were elected for four year terms and representatives, for terms of two years. Voters must be free white men, twenty-one years of age, and citizens and residents of the state for two years before the election. A voter must also own a freehold of fifty acres of land, or a town lot, held by him for six months before the election. However, if he did not possess a freehold or a town lot, he could cast yet his ballot if he had been a resident of the election district for six months prior to the election, and if he had paid a tax during the preceding year of three shillings toward the support of the government. Voters might be required to produce certificates of citizenship and receipts from tax collectors.<sup>6</sup>

It will be noted that each of these constitutions provided for a bicameral legislative assembly, which was to be the driving wheel of government. This marked a change from the colonial period, where there had been a House elected by the people, which in turn chose a Council from among its own members. Also the executive was given the title *governor*,

<sup>5</sup> Cooper, *Statutes of South Carolina*, I, p. 188.

<sup>6</sup> Cooper, *Statutes of South Carolina*, I, pp. 185 and 186.

instead of that of *president*, used after the royal governor fled, and he lost his veto power.<sup>7</sup> Although still high, the property qualifications for office-holding were considerably lower in the constitution of 1790 than in that of 1778. The religious qualification for holding offices was removed, and voters were no longer obliged to believe in the existence of God and in a life after death. There was no longer to be a privy council. The terms of senators were lengthened from one to four years, and the residence requirement for voters was increased from one to two years—which were both steps in the direction of conservatism. Neither constitution required voters to own land, although each made necessary the payment of a small tax. There was no idea that any but whites would participate in government.

An interesting provision of both of these constitutions excluded any clergyman, "while he continues in the exercise of his pastoral function," from being governor, lieutenant governor, senator, representative, or member of the privy council.<sup>8</sup> Timothy Ford, a Northerner who came to live in the state, observed this and considered it quite narrow. He was told that "it got a place in the constitution chiefly to exclude one parson Tennant (a Presbyterian) and who opposed with great eloquence and finally with success the attempts that were made" in 1778 "to establish hierarchy and fix the episcopalians as the only legal and Supreme Church in this country."<sup>9</sup>

There were to be other officers of government, judges, sheriffs, commissioners of the treasury, a secretary of state, an attorney general, a surveyor general, and others, all elected by the legislative assembly.<sup>10</sup> Thus, as I have stated before, this organ was the driving wheel of government.

Control of the Assembly rested with the low country parishes, with their small white population, large number of slaves, and valuable landed estates. The up country had much less influence in the Assembly, being poorer and with much fewer slaves, although its white population was distinctly

<sup>7</sup> Ramsay, *History of South Carolina*, II, p. 138.

<sup>8</sup> Cooper, *Statutes of South Carolina*, I, pp. 142 and 188.

<sup>9</sup> *Diary of Timothy Ford*, S. C. Hist. and Gen. Magazine, XIII, p. 196.

<sup>10</sup> Cooper, *Statutes of South Carolina*, I, pp. 143 and 190.



larger. Some figures may be given in the way of illustration. By the constitution of 1778, 126 representatives and 18 senators were elected by the low country parishes, while the middle and up country districts chose 76 representatives and 11 senators.<sup>11</sup> According to the constitution of 1790 the low country had 70 representatives and 20 senators, while those of the middle and upper country numbered 54 and 19 respectively.<sup>12</sup> I have worked out these figures after careful examination of the documents under consideration. It can readily be seen that by the first of these the low country had an overwhelming majority in both branches of the assembly. By the second its preponderance was not near so great, but it still elected more assemblymen than the interior. Also, as slavery was extending, parts of the middle country would be very apt to throw their support to the tidewater. Brevard states that at the convention at Columbia which drew up the constitution of 1790, there was a struggle for power and equal rights between lower and upper country, but that a spirit of compromise and of mutual concession was observed.<sup>13</sup> Here we see the rivalry between the old slaveholding tidewater parishes and the new poor frontier districts, peopled by different stocks, with different interests, and not held together by any common bond until the days of cotton culture and of the consequent extension of slavery. A very carefully worked out table of figures for population, representation, and taxation was published in Charleston in 1794, and I submit it, calling attention to the fact that Cheraw and Orangeburg Districts are coupled with the low country parishes, although they belong properly to the middle region. This certainly shows well the glaring inequality of representation, which also constantly tended to increase as the population of the up country grew much more rapidly than that of the tidewater. I will add that this table seems to have some inaccuracies in its estimates of population. The document runs as follows:

"A Schedule of Numbers, Representation, Taxes, Slaves, and entire Population, in the different Districts, Counties and

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 139 and 140, vol. I.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 184-186, Vol. I.

<sup>13</sup> Cooper, *Statutes of South Carolina*, I, p. 436.

Parishes of this State, agreeably to the Constitution, Appius's Schedule, the Census taken by order of Congress, and the Tax Return for the year 1792, as deposited in the Treasury.

PARISHES	White Inhab- itants	Repre- senta- tives	Sena- tors	Taxes	Slaves	Entire Popula- tion
<i>Charleston District</i>						
St. Philip and St. Michael, .....	8,089	15	2	£10,671 13 4	20,084	
St. Bartholomew's, .....	2,138	3	1	1,566 10 4	4,829	
St. John's, Berkley, .....	692	3	1	1,115 11 6	3,393	
St. George's, Dorchester, .....	1,252	3	1	504 13 4	2,133	
St. Stephen's, .....	226	3	1	958 6 9	2,874	
St. James's, Santee, .....	437	3	1	846 3 11	2,502	
St. Thomas's, .....	397	3	1	895 19 5	2,173	
Christ Church, .....	566	3	1	631 16 8	1,875	
St. James's, Goose-Creek, .....	439	3	1	295 8 10	872	
St. John's, Colleton, .....	585	3	1	732 8 6	2,048	
St. Andrew's, .....	370	3	1	1,020 0 6	2,946	
St. Paul's, .....	276	3	1	2,220 2 3	1,563	
Total .....	15,452	48	13	£21,473 14 6	47,302	
<i>Beaufort District</i>						
St. Helena's, .....	4,364	3	1	£ 1,144 13 2	3,612	
St. Luke's, .....		3	1	767 2 4	3,829	
Prince William's, .....		3	1	468 7 5	1,302	
St. Peter's, .....		3	1	642 0 0	1,450	
Total .....	4,364	12	4	£ 3,022 2 11	10,193	
<i>Georgetown District</i>						
All Saints, .....	429	1	1	£ 525 9 9	1,563	
Prince George's, .....	5,031	5	1	1,765 13 4	5,851	
Prince Frederick's, .....	3,418	4	1	1,294 9 5	2,652	
Total .....	8,878	10	3	£ 3,585 12 6	10,066	
<i>Cheraw District</i>						
Total .....	7,618	6	2	£ 966 18 1	2,897	
<i>Orangeburgh District</i>						
Total .....	12,412	10	3	£ 1,677 0 1	4,861	
Total of the above five districts...	48,724	86	25	£30,725 8 1	75,319	
White Inhabitants, 48,724.						
Amount of Population .....						124,043

COUNTIES	White Inhabitants	Representatives	Senators	Taxes	Slaves	Entire Population
<i>Ninety-Six District</i>						
Edgefield County, .....	9,785	3	1	£ 655 8 12	2,486	
Abbeville County, .....	7,493	3	1	438 1 9	1,507	
Laurens County, .....	8,210	3	1	343 8 2	838	
Newberry County, .....	8,186	3	1	461 1 9	1,777	
Total .....	33,674	12	4	£ 1,897 5 12	6,604	
<i>Washington District</i>						
Pendleton County, .....	8,731	3	1	£ 235 19 0	752	
Greenville County, .....	5,888	2	1	192 6 8	607	
Total .....	14,619	5	2	£ 428 5 8	1,359	
<i>Pinckney District</i>						
Union County, .....	6,430	2	1	£ 409 7 0	967	
Spartan County, .....	7,907	2	1	343 12 10	788	
York County, .....	5,652	3	1	290 11 11	1,016	
Chester County, .....	5,881	2	0	316 1 4	806	
Total .....	25,870	9	3	£ 1,360 3 1	3,577	
<i>Camden District</i>						
Fairfield County, .....	5,138	2		£ 345 0 2	1,151	
Richland County, .....	2,479	2		556 19 6	2,148	
Clarendon County, .....	1,790	2		528 5 7	1,326	
Claremont County, .....	2,338	2		435 8 0	1,603	
Kershaw County, .....	4,000	2	1	520 14 3	1,456	
Lancaster County, .....	4,864	2		213 16 7	602	
Total .....	20,709	12	3	£ 2,600 4 1	8,286	
Total of the above four districts ..	94,872	38	12	£ 6,285 18 9	14,826	

 114,698<sup>u</sup>

The establishment of the centrally located Columbia as capital in place of Charleston in 1790 was itself a concession to the up country deserving attention at this point. During the legislative session of 1785 this question was bitterly disputed.<sup>15</sup> About a year later the legislature provided for the building of Columbia, and in 1790 its first session was held there. Yet this "was more properly a division of the government," for the principal officers continued to live in Charleston. The governor was never obliged to be at Columbia, except when the legislature was in session. The supreme court was held there but a few days in the year. And the officers of the secretary, the treasurer, and the surveyor-general were divided at much expense between the two cities.

But it must not be supposed that the up country tamely acquiesced in this state of affairs. There was a constant strug-

<sup>14</sup> *The City Gazette*, (Charleston, S. C.), August 7, 1794.

<sup>15</sup> *The Columbian Herald*, (Charleston, S. C.), March 28, 1785.

gle on its part to secure equality in the government and to have representation apportioned according to population, instead of being worked out according to a plan by which property values, including slaves and landed estates, were included. This struggle was conducted both by constant agitation in the newspapers and by the presentation of appeals and motions to the legislative assembly. Shortly after the constitution of 1790 was adopted an association was formed with the prominent Robert Goodloe Harper as its president to bring about a reform in the representative system.<sup>16</sup> The statistics just quoted constitute a typical article published on the subject. Another, also of August, 1794, was the fifth of a series of "Letters of Appius to the Citizens of South Carolina." This stated that during the colonial period the elections had been controlled by the parishes, and that no up-countryman ever sat in the Assembly until 1764. During the Revolution a state constitution was framed which gave the interior more representation, but not yet enough. By it the Districts of Charleston, Beaufort, and Georgetown had more representatives than all the rest of the state. In 1789 the legislature resolved to call a convention to revise the constitution. Delegates to this were to be chosen in proportion to free population in both the parishes and the counties. However, the low country members prevented this, and as a result its membership was formed in the same manner as that of the Assembly. Thus no effective reform was accomplished, and the one-fifth population in the low country maintained its supremacy over the four-fifths of the upper country. The number of representatives was reduced by one half, but the proportion remained the same as before.<sup>17</sup> There are some inaccuracies in this article, but it is nevertheless significant and interesting.

The agitation in the legislature may be taken up next. On December 10, 1794, "Petitions were presented to the House from the Inhabitants in Winton, Union, Kershaw, Richland, Pendleton, Laurens, Lancaster, Greenville, Fairfield, Chesterfield, Chester, Abbeville and Spartan election Districts, stating to the House the great Inequality of the Representation in the

<sup>16</sup> Cooper, *Statutes of South Carolina*, I, p. 436.

<sup>17</sup> *The City Gazette*, (Charleston, S. C.), August 12, 1794.

Legislature of their respective election Districts, and Pray that the House will take the Premises into consideration and to Equalize the proportion of the Members of the Senate and House of Representatives for the respective election Districts in this State."<sup>18</sup> When these petitions were referred to the committee of the whole house for consideration, the vote stood 54 to 54, and the speaker gave the casting vote in the affirmative.<sup>19</sup> On December 12th the House resolved itself into a committee of the whole house to consider the matter. By a vote of 58 ayes to 53 noes, it was resolved, that "it is inexpedient to grant the prayer of the Petitions in as much as the Representation established by the present Constitution was founded in a spirit of Compromise and in an Equipoise of Interests between the different parts of the State; and has been proved by Experience well calculated to preserve the Tranquillity and advance the Prosperity thereof."<sup>20</sup> Again, on December 3, 1795, "Twenty-six Memorials of the Freemen residing in the upper Districts of this State were presented to the House, praying that the present System of Representation may be altered as soon as the Forms prescribed by the Constitution will permit and some other adopted in its stead, by which the powers of Government may be more Equally distributed among the Three great Divisions, of which their Community is Composed." These were referred to a committee.<sup>21</sup> Eleven days later the report on these petitions was brought up, and the House voted by 53 ayes to 47 noes to defer consideration of it until December 27th,<sup>22</sup> and then adjourned on the 19th. On December 13th of the next year the House resolved itself into a committee of the whole house to take into immediate consideration the report of the committee on the twenty-six memorials "or the Freemen of the Six Upper Districts" as to equal distribution of representation. The committee reported that "it is inexpedient to grant the prayer of the Petitioners, in as much as the Representation established by the present Constitution was founded in a Spirit of Compromise, and

<sup>18</sup> Journals of the House of Representatives of S. C., 1794, p. 119.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, 1794, p. 133.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, 1794, p. 144.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, 1795, p. 156.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, 1795, p. 274.

. . . has been proved by Experience well calculated to preserve the Tranquillity" of the state. This report was agreed to by the House.<sup>23</sup> Three days later a motion was brought up in the Senate, "Resolved, That the representation of this State is unequal and unjust, and that an alteration therein ought to be made." By a vote of 17 ayes to 15 noes it was resolved that consideration of this motion should be put off until February 1st next.<sup>24</sup>

On December 3, 1802, "Major Goodwin from the Committee to whom were referred Sundry Memorials from a number of the Inhabitants of Union, Abbeville, and other Districts, praying for a reform in the Representation in the State Legislature—Respectfully, Reported—That deeply impressed with the magnitude, and importance of the objects of the petitioners, and sensible of the conflicting local Interests of the State, whenever the question of reform in the Representation is agitated, they have investigated the grievances complained of, with all the calm attention, and serious deliberation they demand; without entering into those lengthy details . . . they beg leave to propose the adoption of the following Resolutions, which if concurred in by the Senate, they recommend that permission be given to bring in a Bill . . . , or that a Convention of the people be called to alter and amend those articles of the Constitution of this State which relate to Representation. . . .

"1. Resolved—That a Government founded on the free and equal Representation of all the people is the best that human society recognizes, and is calculated in its operation (without intrenching on an equality of conditions) the most effectually to secure an equality of rights, and opens to social man, the fairest prospect of pursuing his own political happiness.

"2. Resolved—That tho' the present Representation is unequal and unjust, yet from a regard to the local, and peculiar situation of this State, and pursuing the same spirit of compromise which dictated the last State Constitution, we deem it inexpedient to make population the sole Basis of Representation in the State Legislature.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, 1796, p. 139.

<sup>24</sup> Journals of the Senate of S. C., 1796, p. 159.

"3. Resolved—That it is expedient, and comports with the true Interest, and welfare of the people of this State now to alter, and amend the Constitution, so as to effect a Reform in the State Representation on a joint Ratio of population and wealth, and that a Reform on such a Ratio will not intrench on the inequality of conditions in the State, will promote the prosperity of, and will harmonize the whole State."<sup>25</sup>

Conservative as these recommendations were, the Senate did nothing in the matter.

Again, in December, 1803, a bill was brought up in the House to amend the constitution so far as it related to representation in the legislature. This bill passed its second reading and was sent to the Senate, but it did not become a law.

At last on December 17, 1808, an amendment to the constitution was ratified according to which the House was to be composed of 124 members apportioned among the election districts according to the white population and to the amount of all taxes raised by the legislature—one representative to every sixty-second part of the whole number of white inhabitants, and one representative also for every sixty-second part of all the taxes raised. If additional fractions of both formed a unit, an additional representative would be allowed. There was to be one senator from each election district, except that formed by the Parishes of St. Philip and St. Michael, which was to have two.<sup>26</sup> These two parishes comprised Charleston.

Two years later another amendment gave the franchise to every free white man, twenty-one years of age, who was a citizen of the state, and who had resided therein for two years and in his election district for six months before the date of the election. Paupers and noncommissioned officers and privates of the United States army were excepted.<sup>27</sup>

Reading of the above may seem tedious, but it reveals a significant struggle of the up country for equality in representation in the legislature, and also a struggle for manhood suffrage. The amendment of 1808 did not base representation solely on population, but nevertheless made a great concession

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, 1802, p. 79.

<sup>26</sup> Cooper, *Statutes of South Carolina*, I, pp. 193-195.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, I, p. 195.

to the up-country as to the House. And of course by then the interior was growing in wealth too. As to the Senate, the supremacy of the low country was done away with entirely. The amendment of 1810 eliminated the tax paying qualification for the suffrage.

With these reforms South Carolina was content. And so, while all free white men could vote, office holding was restricted to property owners. Thus the state was controlled by the planter class down until after the Civil War. This was what we might call a "limited democracy," the poor whites being content to follow the lead of the slaveholders, partly because of the great political aptitude of the latter, and partly because the presence of large numbers of slaves tended to make the whites coöperate. To my mind this political organization is most significant. Its development tended to unify ideals of government and to foster a national spirit which was drawing "Dixie Land" farther and farther away from the other sections of the country. Highminded, energetic, typically Anglo-Saxon, the slavocracy yet had well defined ideas as to society and government which separated it widely from the free communities of the North and West.



## The Beautiful Angel and His Biographers\*

NEWMAN I. WHITE  
Trinity College

Literary biography is a problem whose difficulties are still far from solution. Before the seventeenth century it was mainly a problem of insufficient data; nowadays it is often a problem of too much data. Letters, published works, contemporary journals, the results of investigative scholarship, and memoirs,—all lie open to the biographer; and all, too often, result in a work of confusion. The letters were perhaps too hastily written in the very cases on which the biographer lays stress; the works are too often less representative of the normal man than of his highly excited, almost sublimated "other self"; the journals and memoirs are subtly biased to a degree rendered insoluble by time. Even investigative scholarship is too often warped by a consuming desire to "prove" something. When literary biographers were forced to work comparatively *in vacuo*, they turned out such products as Godwin's four volume *Life of Chaucer*, about a man whose biography, better known to-day than in Godwin's time, could still be compressed into an article. We have had the various "lives" of Shakespeare, all constrained to dress up theatrical records, legal documents, signatures, and descriptions of Elizabethan London as biography. The two best literary biographies in English were both written by men who were contemporaries of their subjects and enjoyed personal advantages unusual to most biographers. Even so, the best of these, Boswell's, is an achievement which Macaulay could explain only by making successful biography the result of self-debasement, and Carlyle, by making it the result of an ennobling hero-worship. Where partisanship has affected biography we have had such products as the legends that still pass current about Tom Paine.

When we come to the Romantic poets of the early nineteenth century, the biographical scene is one of extraordinary

\* *Ariel: The Life of Shelley*. By André Maurois. Translated by Ella D'Arcy. D. Appleton and Co. New York, 1924. Pp. 336.

*Shelley and the Unromantics*. By Olwen Ward Campbell. Charles Scribner's Sons. New York, 1924. Pp. 307.

confusion. Scott was lucky, not only in having a good biographer, but in being a comparatively simple subject for biography. Keats has fared moderately well, for similar reasons. But the others! Coleridge to this day has no biography worthy of the name. Wordsworth, aside from Legouis' study of his youth, has been very inadequately served. As to factual matters, the recent discovery of the Annette Vallon episode is a clear indication that the older biographers were remiss; and as for the presentation of character, Wordsworth is so dull in his biographies that we are almost forced to conclude that the biographers have missed some element of brightness in the man. Byron, the only person who has written in a sprightly way about Wordsworth, has by his very manner left a more convincing character sketch than many others no doubt more literally true. Byron's own biography has been rendered almost entirely worthless by the partisanship of the writers and by Byron's own poses and mystifications. Lord Lovelace is fundamentally right when he condemns them all in his astonishingly written *Astarte*. Only Ethel C. Mayne has produced anything like a good biography of Byron, and her book is unfortunately lacking in that impression of the fullness and extent of life which constitutes a principal merit in the great English literary biographies and in those English novels that come nearest to the illusion of actual life.

As for Shelley, he has been one of the most written about of all English poets. When Mr. J. P. Anderson printed his bibliography of Shelley in 1887, there were fourteen Shelley biographies in existence. Their story is in the main one of frustration. This in spite of the fact that, as Mr. Olwen Ward Campbell says, the contemporary records provide better biographical material than those of almost any other English poet. Mrs. Shelley, the logical person to write the poet's life, was halted by Sir Timothy Shelley's threat to cut off her income if she brought Shelley's name before the public during his lifetime. But he later consented to her editing of Shelley's poems, and as Mrs. Campbell has rather astutely pointed out, although he forbade the *publication* of a biography during his lifetime, there was nothing to prevent the *writing* of one to be published

later. Captain Tom Medwin, whose memoir and later life of Shelley should have been most valuable, has become a byword among Shelley scholars for inaccuracy, although Mrs. Campbell has done well to take a stand against the tendency to discount anything Medwin says simply because it is Medwin. The picturesque Trelawney has written a most valuable book of memoirs based upon personal intimacy, but we must never forget that the intimacy was of only six month's duration, that Trelawney, who was in some ways more violently romantic than Shelley himself, dearly loved a romantic incident and is characterized by Byron as a liar and by Mrs. Campbell as a ruffian. Peacock wrote his memoir long after the facts had grown cold in his mind, and when, perhaps, his pen had grown a little perfunctory. Mrs. Shelley did supply some valuable biographical notes in her 1839 edition, but even at that time the reviewers professed themselves dissatisfied with the available facts about Shelley's life and demanded a real biography.

None of the books by Shelley's intimates could pretend to be a full biography of the poet. One of his intimates, however, Thomas Jefferson Hogg, contributed a series of biographical articles to the *New Monthly Magazine* in 1832 which considerably stimulated the growing interest in Shelley and resulted in at least two magazines expressing the wish that the author would undertake a full biography of the poet. The first real biography of Shelley (if we omit Medwin's as too inaccurate to count) was then undertaken. Hogg was given access to the documents in the hands of the Shelley family. But unfortunately, there were incidents in Hogg's own conduct toward Shelley's first wife that made it necessary for him to manipulate some of the facts. Still more unfortunately, Hogg was both a colossal egotist and a humorist. In his account of Shelley at Oxford he has left one of the best beginnings for a biography that any English poet ever had, but Hogg saw Shelley only as a mad-cap youth who was, miraculously, a divine poet at the same time. For the poet he had a high regard, but for the habits and behavior in which Shelley had his earthly existence "the gluttonous Hogg," as Shelleyans have stigmatized him, had only an alert and indulgent sense of humor. Humor

and idolatry do not mix. Lady Shelley, who had made her deceased father-in-law's reputation almost a religious mission, withdrew the manuscripts that had been placed in Hogg's hands, and the biography came to an abrupt end. Enter next one or two shorter biographies of no particular value or interest; then the *bête-noire* of all good Shelleyans, the greatly anathematized and little read J. Cordy Jeaffreson. Jeaffreson's *The Real Shelley* (two volumes) is vigorously and crudely iconoclastic. Its tone and orthodox bias seem like the last words of the *Quarterly* reviewers. A new idol, a hideously false one, was being erected, and Jeaffreson's rôle was to smite the false prophets who were busily building a profane temple. Field Place, the home of Sir Percy and Lady Shelley, seemed to him to be the seminary of Shelleyolatry; and his whole book is a reaction not only against what Field Place had done to falsify Shelley, but what it was planning to do. He defended Harriet Shelley's reputation against assaults still to be delivered from Field Place. To him Shelley was the seducer of the two sixteen-year-old girls he afterwards married, and no amount of literary genius could turn calculating seduction into mere youthful impetuosity. The beautiful angel was rather a sneak. Jeaffreson's concluding chapter opens with a list, almost in the form of a legal brief, of thirty-one "willful misstatements" which he claims to have established against Shelley. Many of them he did establish.

Almost on the heels of Jeaffreson's book came the authorized and still standard life of Shelley by Edward Dowden. Dowden had full access to the Shelley papers and polished out a biography which, if not fully satisfactory, has yet the advantage of being the best source of biographical information about Shelley and of being honest in intention. Yet Dowden, too, falls too much under the sway of the poet—Jeaffreson would say of Field Place—and is a little too concerned to smooth out his hero. As Mrs. Campbell aptly observes, "He is too ready to fling the cloak of his sentimental eloquence into the tiniest puddles lest Shelley should acquire a touch of earth." So ill did Dowden's "cake-walk" manner and charity for Shelley's faults suit with the plain notions and violent chivalry of Mark

Twain, that the *Defense of Harriet Shelley*, which Dowden's book provoked, may be characterized as a veritable horse-whipping.

The conflict has continued. Matthew Arnold's unsympathetic essay on Shelley caused violent nausea among ardent Shelleyans and his magniloquent dictum about the beautiful and ineffectual angel beating in the void his luminous wings in vain has recently provoked the retort that the only void in which Shelley beat his wings was a void in Mr. Arnold's understanding. It was but a comparatively short time ago that Mr. A. Clutton-Brock's *Shelley—The Man and the Poet* was the occasion for an essay from Paul Elmer More which began by wondering why the Shelleyans were always so mealy-mouthed and straddling.

It was a legitimate wonder. Is it a mere happen-so, born of the normal differences of men's judgment that produces this condition—in other words, is the condition not so extraordinary after all—or is it a peculiar something in the poet Shelley? A biographer or a critic or even such a specialist in character as Mr. Gamaliel Bradford does not catch any character between book-covers as a small boy catches a butterfly under a hat. If the butterfly does not fall within a certain genus or family, the urchin is worried not at all; but not so the biographer. To him, "consistency is the virtue most in demand." Types that are not understandable he cannot help subtly warping into types that are. Jeaffreson would have the butterfly as a grasshopper; Lady Shelley would have it a bird of paradise.

Shelley conforms to biographers, apparently, about as he conformed to the Church of England. While Mary Shelley talks of philosophy, Jeaffreson talks of "willful untruths." While Leigh Hunt and Lady Shelley talk of philanthropy, Mark Twain thunders of desertion. While Dowden talks of Shelley's beneficent influence on Byron, the "unromantics," as Mrs. Campbell seems to call the unsympathetic, think about his influence on Harriet Shelley and Elizabeth Hitchener. All are about equally right, and all are incapable of synthesizing the conflicting traits of Shelley into an authentic human being. Some of the inconsistency, no doubt, is merely that between

the younger Shelley and the later Shelley who had learned much of the exacting world which he wished simultaneously to flee from and to save.

There is, however, a special quality about both Shelley and his writings that makes authentic biography and criticism peculiarly difficult. For most readers, Shelley is a spiritual hypnotist. His splendid intimations of what man might be if he could ignore the laws of society and human nature so rouse our sympathies and enthusiasms that we unconsciously waive the application of these laws to Shelley himself. It is not a base weakness to be alive to unearthly harmonies, transcendent enthusiasms, and fervid but far-distant hopes. Nor is the passionate surrender of dispassion which so often accompanies this responsiveness to Shelley an ignoble emotion—but it is an emotion rather than a rational state of mind. It has given rise to many poems about Shelley, and some excellent passages of emotional criticism, but it has been a lion in the path of biography.

One result of this special quality in Shelley is that from the first he has been not merely a literary personality, but with many admirers almost a cult. How, otherwise, are we to account for the presence of so many privately printed bits of Shelleyana, mainly by one small group, and so many important diaries and manuscripts still held unpublished? There are nearly a hundred items of the foregoing description, not to mention between twenty and thirty limited publications of the Shelley Society. How otherwise are we to account for such a book as *Letters About Shelley* devoted to the correspondence of members of this group? Shelley has come under some suspicion as the result of the general tendency of such a situation to form a clique of Shelley worshippers with a set of guarded mysteries. It must not be forgotten, however, that at least one distinguished Shelleyan, Mr. T. J. Wise, formerly secretary of the Shelley Society, has devoted a fortune to the acquisition of the finest collection of Shelleyana in the world, including many unpublished manuscripts and rare volumes that might not otherwise have been preserved. It has been said that Mr. Wise's collection will ultimately become the property of the

British people. Mr. Wise, meanwhile, has become known among scholars in both England and America for his liberal helpfulness and has placed valuable materials at the disposal of scholars with a generosity not to be expected of public libraries.

At times and with various people the admiration of Shelley has assumed some of the features of a genuine religious cult. There are hints of this in the way in which a few disciples such as Mary Shelley and Leigh Hunt labored to keep Shelley's reputation alive in the days of his threatened obscurity. Trelawney's continued devotion carries something of the same hint. "Bye the bye," wrote Trelawney to Jane Clairmont, no doubt jocosely, "why did he not project a sect on the Mormon plan? I would gladly have joined him and founded a settlement." "My dear, my divine friend," wrote Leigh Hunt to Elizabeth Kent, and again to Horace Smith, "I cannot help thinking of him as if he were as alive as ever, so unearthly he always appeared to me, and so seraphical a King [sic] of the elements; and this is what all of his friends say." Maria Gisborne's unpublished journal says that Hunt "considers Shelley as the discoverer of a pure original spring of human knowledge, from whence other men, having perceived its existence, will dig channels in which rivers of knowledge will flow in all directions, less pure than at their source, but more adapted to the senses and comprehension of mankind." And in 1826, Mary Shelley, after alluding to "circumstances so strange, so inexplicable, so full of terrific interest," in Shelley's last days, added: "I do not in any degree believe that his being was regulated by the same laws which governs us ordinary mortals." Individually, several of these excerpts may seem insignificant, but cumulatively they suggest more than a mortal poet. It must be remembered that, according to Medwin, Shelley did become a sort of Bible for the Owenites. Had all these facts been available to Jeaffreson, even that agnostic must have admitted that the personality on which they focus was one of the most extraordinary characters of the century. For the biographer, however, they present only an added fascination and a new difficulty.

A difficulty of another sort with which would-be biographers of Shelley have been hampered has been Jeaffreson's old antagonist, Field Place. How much constraint the Shelley family has put upon Shelleyan biography will probably never be accurately known. The relations of Hogg, Dowden, and Jeaffreson to Field Place has already been noted. Mary Shelley made of Shelley's reputation a conjugal mission; Lady Shelley made it a filial one in almost a Confucian sense. Rightly or wrongly, Edward Trelawney wrote to Jane Clairmont in 1871 that "*The Memorials of Shelley* Lady Shelley has put her name to, but it was done by a Mr. Garnett of the British Museum." Buxton Forman was forced to cancel several pages of the preface to his standard edition of Shelley because of some trifling but strenuous objections by Sir Percy and Lady Shelley to the frontispiece he had chosen, and in 1887 Professor Dowden and Mr. T. J. Wise found it expedient to invent a "Charles Alfred Seymour, member of the Philadelphia Historical Society" as the editor of *Poems and Sonnets by Percy Bysshe Shelley*, because "Lady Shelley expressed dissent (as she did with most projects connected with Shelley not originating directly with herself) although she held no interest whatever in the copyright of the verses."

Certain facts about Mrs. Julian Marshall's *Life and Letters of Mary Wollstonecraft Shelley* and Mr. Roger Ingpen's *Shelley in England* stimulate further wonder about the relations of Field Place to Shelleyan biography. In 1889 Mrs. Marshall, writing, as she claimed, with full and unrestricted access to the Shelley papers at Field Place, omits all reference to John Howard Paine, and the literary world was therefore astonished when in 1907 some papers of Paine's were published which showed that he had for some time been in constant correspondence with Mary Shelley on such important questions as his love for her and her great desire to form a friendship with Washington Irving through his agency. Mary Shelley's papers in the hands of the Shelley family could scarcely have been utterly blank with reference to this episode; hence Mrs. Marshall's silence with regard to it must be regarded as queer, considering her "unrestricted" use of the papers. Mr. Roger Ingpen published a



number of letters obtained from Field Place in a form that, to Mrs. Campbell at least, shows obvious tampering, though Mrs. Campbell thinks that in one instance the tampering was hardly done by the Shelley family. And before the Shelley papers were finally turned over to the Bodleian Library in 1892—under conditions—Mr. W. M. Rossetti was much upset by information that the Shelley family had recently destroyed a number of documents relating to the poet. The relation between this fact (if Rossetti was correctly informed) and the fact that in a privately printed book called *Shelley and Mary*, which has been carefully guarded and of which only twelve copies were printed, Sir Percy Shelley claimed to have included "all the letters and other documents of a biographical nature at present in the hands of Shelley's representatives," is still not quite clear. Whether the known facts be considered as the whole case or as indications of a greater restrictive activity that is unknown and unproveable, it is clear that adequate and reliable biography does not flourish under such conditions.

A recent influence that has considerably affected the two latest books of Shelleyan biography is that of Mr. Lytton Strachey's Victorian studies. To Mr. Strachey it was evident that a sensation-loving generation of readers would not thrill to the dullness of old-style biography, that pemmican might sustain life but would hardly tickle the palate. The result was a highly spiced, gossipy, semi-novelized form of biographical writing which has had a large share in creating the recent popularity of biography with the reading public. Occasionally some scholar, wedded to footnotes and mustiness, might wonder if such a brilliantly entertaining manner were not intrinsically opposed to strict reliability of detail, or even if the humdrum of which most human experience is compounded could be eliminated from the atmosphere of a book without seeming to eliminate it from the life of the subject; but no matter, the subjects of the new biography assumed, if not a new and active vitality, at least the entertaining illusion of it.

The first book on Shelley to feel this new influence was *Ariel* by André Maurois (Émil Herzog). Anyone inclined to think that the difference between this volume and the mass of

Shelley literature is due solely to the much-advertised Gallic clarity and incisiveness needs only to compare it with Felix Rabbe's *Shelley—The Man and the Poet* to realize that the Gallic spirit is sometimes as capable of ecstatic hero-worship as the Anglo-Saxon spirit. It is the combination of the Gallic spirit and the Lytton Strachey spirit that makes *Ariel* so different from the other Shelley books. It approaches with cool, intellectual detachment a subject which previous writers had approached so often from an emotional bias—either sympathetic or antagonistic—that the subject itself had developed a quality almost suspect to the unpartisan reader. Like Hogg, M. Maurois applies wit, but without Hogg's personal obtrusiveness. One epigrammatic flash of worldly wisdom for such as care to guide their interpretation by it, and M. Maurois is again calmly devoted to an objective and dispassionate statement of facts. These facts are not visibly documented. There is not a footnote or a reference to any writer on Shelley in the whole book. Only one who had gone thoroughly into the mass of existing personalia about Shelley would suspect the great amount of industry and selection that went to the making of this book so unclogged with scholarly reference. Although M. Maurois is scrupulous as to the authenticity of his materials, he does give numerous incidents dramatic vitality by supplying conversation and ancillary "business" which from a literal point of view may justify Mrs. Campbell's remark that the book is "partly fictitious." As an artistic achievement in blending difficult materials into a smooth and finished literary product, *Ariel* commands even higher respect than as biography. Yet as biography it must stand as one of the best books produced about Shelley. It achieves an objective and dispassionate point of view very rarely found in the literature dealing with Shelley. Defense of Shelley for this or chiding of Shelley for that is severely let alone. A biographer's opinions of character and art M. Maurois evidently considered no proper part of his book. Of course he did not, as he evidently wished, escape putting an interpretation upon Shelley's character, but this interpretation is not preached at the reader; it proceeds inevitably from the fact that an author with his own view of life—

a somewhat worldly one—is choosing and arranging incidents to illustrate the character of another man. Thus by his handling of incidents connected with Jane Clairmont M. Maurois conveys the impression that he thinks there was more between Shelley and Jane Clairmont than Mrs. Shelley or the orthodox writers suspected, a suspicion that is likely to be dismissed by most fair-minded students of the poet as too simple—and too Gallic—for the facts. An occasional injection of ironic worldliness, not too caustic, might in the long run prove beneficial to Shelley's reputation, which has suffered too much from the other extreme. In the case of *Ariel* it has produced one of the most entertaining books ever written about Shelley. It is inherent in the nature of the case that the more ardent Shelleyans consider this very quality "an unfortunate tendency to misrepresent and vulgarize." M. Maurois is hardly to be censured if in the final analysis *Ariel* is no more than what it was intended to be, a witty, dramatic-narrative character study rather than a substantial biography.

About the only points in which Mrs. Campbell's *Shelley and the Unromantics* resembles the Lytton Strachey method are in style and in the sketches of the "unromantics." Mrs. Campbell attains a decided improvement in readability over the old-style biographies by the vigorous expression of forthright opinions. She retains the old paraphernalia of footnotes and discussions of facts and opinions advanced by others, but she enlivens all such matter with a far more outspoken and aggressive personality than the older writers would have thought consistent with decorum. Sometimes this personality takes the form of decrying other writers on Shelley. Thus she mentions Buxton Forman only to belabor him, a little repetitiously, for vulgarity. She ridicules W. M. Rossetti in one footnote, finds half of M. Koszul's book a travesty, calls Roger Ingpen a bungler, and condemns A. Clutton-Brock for certain failures of understanding. She demolishes George Santayana in three separate sarcasms, and she deals Matthew Arnold the regulation punishment inaugurated in the late 1880's by Stopford Brooke. Since the first section of *Shelley and the Unromantics*, consisting of vivid sketches of the "unromantics" (under

which name one is surprised to find Byron and Trelawney) claims that none of Shelley's friends was really fitted to associate with him, one cannot help wondering if Mrs. Campbell's attitude toward Shelley is really greatly different from that of other rare souls who make a special point of their own sympathetic comprehension of a poet too rare for the vulgar to see aright. From this point of view Mrs. Campbell seems almost to have invented a new *solitude à deux*, consisting of the poet and one interpreter.

Shelley, of all poets except Browning, did not need another book of this kind. Fortunately, Mrs. Campbell's is a good deal more than this. The sketches of the unromantics, really one of the best sections of the book; the chapter on *Prometheus Unbound*, the best treatment, except Rossetti's, of this poem; and the concluding chapter on Romanticism, which suggests a new definition of a very indefinite force and discovers Christ as the first Romanticist, must all be passed with a mere mention. The biographical chapters, however, cannot be passed without admiring the skillful and thorough use of Shelley's letters. Many of these letters, notably those recently printed by Mr. Ingpen and Mr. Murray, were accessible to Mrs. Campbell first of all the Shelley biographers. Mrs. Campbell makes such frequent and adroit use of quotations from these letters that she may almost be said to have demonstrated to future biographers how much more human Shelley may be made to appear from the intelligent use of materials lying directly to hand.

Future biographies, of course, will be written, for the satisfactory and definitive biography of Shelley is yet to appear. M. Maurois and Mrs. Campbell have both made permanent additions to Shelleyan biography, but neither has written the biography for which Shelley has long waited, as probably neither intended to attempt doing. With all the difficulties that beset Shelleyan biography, it is probable that the really adequate biography of Shelley will never be written. To the end of our present Romantic period at least, Shelley will always be to some the beautiful angel on whose wings the earthy smudges are so irrelevant as to be non-existent. To others, a few, perhaps, the smudges alone are of primary significance

and obscure the fact that the angel sings wildly well. The synthesis of a generally acceptable human character out of such elements and his convincing endowment with daily mundane existence seem scarcely to be hoped for. In spite of all the critical and biographical activity that has centered about Shelley—to some extent, perhaps, even because of it—one might hope almost as reasonably for a good biography of Sappho. Both are at the same time almost imperishable lyric voices and almost irrecoverable personalities.

## The Mediaevalism of Henry Adams

HERBERT L. CREEK  
Purdue University

It is my purpose to examine the motives that caused Henry Adams when nearly sixty years old to renew his studies in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries with a zest and persistence that resulted in one of the best books on the Middle Ages ever written. The fundamental motive was not the wish to use the Middle Ages as a convenient starting point for the application of the laws of physics to human history, much as that possibility fascinated him. Rather it was a desire to escape from the chaos of his own time, which his restless mind never succeeded in reducing to order, and to find emotional repose in the superbly unified and simplified world of mediaeval Catholicism, presided over, not by the Father, not by the Son, but by the Virgin Mother of Jesus. Intellectually the profoundest of sceptics, mingling a note of mockery and doubt with his most striking observations upon life, emotionally he accepted the mediaeval universe in which heaven and earth touched and in which the adoration of woman permeated the institution of chivalry and created the cult of the Virgin Mary. In his mediaeval studies he was engaged in the romantic quest, his blue flower being the simple faith that reared the great cathedrals, and his dream woman, Mary herself.

Although Henry Adams had been a professor of mediaeval history in Harvard for seven years beginning in 1870, training young students in research according to approved German methods, this early excursion into the Middle Ages left no real monument and apparently had little immediate effect on the intellectual and emotional life of the man. Henry Adams turned from the Middle Ages to write his great American history. But in 1895, an elderly and saddened man, he returned to the Middle Ages in a new spirit. Mrs. Cabot Lodge, as he puts it, "bade him follow her to Europe with the Senator and her two sons." In August he found himself for the first time at Caen, Coutances, and Mont-Saint-Michel in Normandy. Amid the great churches he was once more in the twelfth and

thirteen  
of his  
of his  
later m  
for an  
riddles  
fered,  
vey—a  
which  
cation  
Franco  
sion, v  
flat.  
green  
twelfth  
their c  
arches  
In  
of the  
It wa  
tion.  
ten th  
remer  
as Ad  
tinuat  
I  
ences  
Midd  
he co  
doing  
Adam  
F  
ence.  
lution  
certa  
for g  
tions

thirteenth centuries; and he gained what he calls a new sense of history, quite disconnected from the German lecture room of his youth. Four years afterward he definitely began his later mediaeval researches. From Assisi, where he had gone for an interview with St. Francis, "whose solution of historical riddles seemed the most satisfactory—or sufficient—ever offered," he went to Paris and there "began a methodical survey—a triangulation—of the twelfth century." The spirit in which he worked is indicated by certain sentences in the *Education*: "The pursuit had a singular French charm which France had long lost—a calmness, lucidity, simplicity of expression, vigor of action, complexity of local color, that made Paris flat. In the long summer days one found a sort of saturated green pleasure in the forests, the gray infinity of rest in the little twelfth century churches that lines them, as unassuming as their own mosses, and as sure of their purpose as their round arches."

In 1905 appeared the book which was the fruit of ten years of thought and experience—*Mont-Saint-Michel and Chartres*. It was privately printed and apparently attracted little attention. Immediately after its completion, he seems to have written the autobiography, and all readers of the *Education* will remember the chapter on "The Dynamo and the Virgin" as well as Adams's statement that the *Education* is merely a continuation of *Mont-Saint-Michel and Chartres*.

I should like, if possible, to indicate the nature of the experiences of Henry Adams in his romantic journey through the Middle Ages between 1895 and 1905—a journey, in fact, that he continued throughout the remainder of his life. But before doing so, I will refer to certain features of the life of Henry Adams that may assist in the interpretation of the later journey.

First, his mind was thoroughly saturated with modern science. He had been immensely interested in the theory of evolution many years before, and his devotion to physics pretty certainly did not begin in later life. Possessing a mind eager for generalizations, he was fascinated by the great generalizations of science.

Second, his life was largely devoted to the search for a thread of connection that would account for the facts of human history. That he failed is known to every reader of the *Education*. Human nature he found inexplicable. But so far as he found any clue, it was in science. And in Lord Kelvin's theory of the dissipation of energy, according to which there must ultimately result a dead solar system, he found an explanation of what seemed to him a decaying world. His profound distrust of democracy, his contempt for modern Americans, the melancholy associated with the feeling that later America had no place for the later Adams—all made the theory of the degradation of energy appealing to him. And he must have been influenced more or less by his brother, Brooks Adams, who was himself a maker of generalizations. In *The Law of Civilization and Decay*, published in 1895, Brooks Adams prophesies the disintegration which is before us because of lost energy. In the essays in *The Degradation of the Democratic Dogma* Henry applies a similar theory with startling consequences. But I am inclined to regard these theories as intellectual play rather than real interpretation, even to Henry Adams himself. History remained to him an enigma to the last.

Third, as just suggested, the mind of Henry Adams played with ideas rather than absorbed them. Therefore one should not regard too seriously what seem to be contradictions. To show what I mean, let me quote from letters written by Henry Adams to Charles Francis Adams, Jr., in 1863. Henry was then secretary to his father, the Ambassador to Great Britain, while Charles was a soldier in the Union army. It was of course the time of one of the crises in American history. On October 2 the young man, who had not yet completed his twenty-fifth year, wrote:

"The truth is, everything in this universe has its regular waves and tides. Electricity, sound, the wind, and I believe every part of organic nature will be brought some day within this law. But my philosophy teaches me, and I firmly believe it, that the laws which govern animated beings will be ultimately found to be at bottom the same with those which rule inanimate nature."<sup>2</sup>

<sup>2</sup> *A Cycle of Adams Letters*, vol. II, pp. 89f.

Tw  
vein:

"Aft  
I have  
result h  
home.  
we'll sa  
and the  
are unal  
prove h  
ferent s  
contribu

All  
the sar  
he had  
ing in

"It  
or have  
ing we  
spiritua  
the min  
selves  
this lif  
back, G  
brutaliz  
examin  
theory,  
earth n  
middle  
membe  
to wor

Pe  
a bit o  
few m  
as Ro  
rialist  
truth  
him o

<sup>2</sup> *Ibi*  
<sup>2</sup> *Ibi*



Twenty-eight days later he wrote in a somewhat similar vein:

"After having passed through all the intermediate phases of belief, I have come out a full-blown fatalist, and what has greatly aided this result has been the observation of the steady movement of affairs at home. The world grows just like a cabbage; or, if the simile is vulgar, we'll say, like an oak. The result will come when the time is ripe, and the only thing that disgusts me much is the consciousness that we are unable to govern it, and the condition that a man of sense can only prove his possession of a soul by remaining in mind a serene and indifferent spectator of the very events to which all his acts most eagerly contribute."<sup>2</sup>

All of this seems materialistic enough. And yet in May of the same year, he had written humorously of a conversation he had heard between Sir Edward Lytton and Robert Browning in this manner:

"It was curious to see two men who, of all others, write for fame, or have done so, ridicule the idea of its real value to them. But Browning went on to get into a very unorthodox humor, and developed a spiritual election that would shock the Pope, I fear. According to him, the minds or souls that really did develop themselves and educate themselves in life, could alone expect to enter a future career for which this life was a preparatory course. The rest were rejected, turned back, God knows what becomes of them, these myriads of savages and brutalized and degraded Christians. Only those that could pass the examination were allowed to commence the new career. This is Calvin's theory, modified; and really it seems not unlikely to me. Thus this earth may serve as a sort of feeder to the next world, as the lower and middle classes here do to the aristocracy, here and there furnishing a member to fill the gaps. The corollaries of this proposition are amusing to work out."<sup>3</sup>

Perhaps there is no absolute contradiction here. But it is a bit difficult to take very seriously a young man who within a few months approves or defends views as far apart in spirit as Robert Browning's opinions of immortality and the materialistic notions revealed in the October letters. The simple truth is that none of these ideas have taken a powerful grip on him or have influenced his character. They are, to use his own

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, vol. II, pp. 96f.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, vol. II, p. 12.

word, "amusing." And I believe that the same adjective may be applied to many of the opinions that he advocated in later life.

The fourth feature of the life of Henry Adams that I wish to emphasize is the influence of women upon him. In spite of his warm friendship for John Hay and Clarence King, it is evident that his response to the women with whom he was associated was unusually sensitive. In the *Education* he tells us that "he made a general law of experience—no woman had ever driven him wrong; no man had ever driven him right." The first great shock of his life was the sudden death of his elder sister when he was about thirty. She was thrown from a cab and injured while in Italy, and died from tetanus. Henry was with her before the end. This is his comment: "He had never seen Nature—only her surface—the sugar coating that she shows to youth. Flung suddenly in his face with the harsh brutality of chance, the terror of the blow stayed by him thenceforth for life, until the repetition made it more than the will could struggle with; more than he could call on himself to bear." The death of his wife some fifteen years later was an even greater blow to him, if we are to trust the words of Mrs. LaFarge, his niece, and of others who knew him, for he himself passes it over in silence. That blow must have seemed the end of life for him. This profound attachment to wife and sister I take to be characteristic of him. In later years he was the friend of women like Mrs. Cameron, wife of the well-known Pennsylvania Senator, and Mrs. Lodge, and evidently he was able to attract and hold the sympathy of accomplished women. Some will remember, too, his saying in his graceful preface to *Mont-Saint-Michel and Chartres* that the book was "for nieces, or for those who are willing, for the time, to be nieces in wish." It is interesting to note also that the book was—at first—read chiefly by women, for in a letter to Professor Cook of Yale, who had written to ask where he could obtain a copy, he said in 1910: "I wrote it, and printed it, some six or eight years ago, to amuse myself and a few friends who wanted to know about Chartres; and I printed as many copies as amply supplied their wants. Quite beyond my intentions, it was taken

up almost exclusively, by women, especially in the Church, who begged of me every copy I had, except half a dozen set aside for public libraries."<sup>4</sup> Mrs. LaFarge tells of the sympathetic attendance that he received from his nieces by blood as well as by wish. And Brooks Adams writes a sentence that should not be forgotten in this connection: "Henry came rather to shun me, seeming to prefer women's society, in which he could be amused and tranquillized." Henry Adams was a man who had not found a place in the world of action, who had not found a satisfactory clue to the interpretation of history, and who depended largely upon women for tranquillity.

Such was the man who in 1895 made the acquaintance of the mediaeval churches—a scientific sceptic, childless, the women for whom he had cared most long dead, and himself no longer young. It is not possible to follow him on his pilgrimage. Therefore it is well to begin at once with a statement of what he found in the Middle Ages.

First of all, he found power. Neither subtlety of thought nor rapidity of movement brought about by modern machinery meant power to him. For him Force had declined since 1200. "Never has the Western world," he says, "shown anything like the energy and unity with which she then flung herself on the East, and for the moment made the East recoil." Applying Lord Kelvin's theory of the degradation of energy, he finds a similar dissipation of energy in history.

"The claim that Reason must be classed as an energy of the highest intensity is itself unreasonable. On the contrary, Reason is the last in time, and therefore the lowest in tension. According to our western standards, the most intense phase of human Energy occurred in the form of religious and artistic emotions,—perhaps in the Crusades and Gothic churches; but since then, though vastly increased in apparent mass, human energy has lost intensity and continues to lose it with accelerated rapidity, as the church proves. Organized in society, as a volume, like the eye in insects, reason acts as an enormously multiplied lens, converging nature's lines of will, and taking direction from them, but adding nothing of its own. . . . Thought then appears in nature as an arrested,—in other words, as a degraded,—physical action. The theory is convenient, and convenience makes law, at least in the laboratory."

<sup>4</sup> *Yale Review*, vol. V, p. 132.

In the Middle Ages Henry Adams finds at least two kinds of power—masculine and feminine,—one represented by the eleventh century, by the *chansons de geste*, by Romanesque architecture, and by the church of Mont-Saint-Michel; the other represented by the twelfth century, by the romances, by Gothic architecture, and by the cathedral of Chartres.

The masculine power of Mont-Saint-Michel he felt strongly on that first wonderful visit of 1895. Writing to his niece, he said:

"About Mont Saint Michel I can say little because it is too big. It is the Church Militant. . . . The Saint Michael of the Mount is as big as Orion and his sword must be as high as Sirius."

The considered statement of *Mont-Saint-Michel and Chartres*, written years later and after other visits, is even stronger:

"And the whole mount still kept the grand style; it expressed the unity of Church and State, God and Man, Peace and War, Life and Death, Good and Bad; it solved the whole problem of the universe. . . . Here is your first eleventh-century church! How does it affect you?"

"Serious and simple to excess! is it not? Young people rarely enjoy it. They prefer the Gothic, even as you see it here, looking at us from the choir, through the great Norman arch. No doubt they are right, since they are young: but men who have lived long and are tired,—who want rest,—who have done with aspirations and ambitions,—whose life has been a broken arch,—feel this repose and self-restraint as they feel nothing else. The quiet strength of these curved lines, the solid support of these heavy columns, the moderate proportions, even the modified lights, the absence of display, of efforts, of self-consciousness, satisfy them as no other art does. They come back to it to rest, after a long circle of pilgrimage,—the cradle of rest from which their ancestors started. Even here they find repose none too deep."

Here surely the authentic Henry Adams speaks, voicing that desire for rest which followed the futile searches of his life. But later he doubts the repose, and seems to feel only the militant power. Not here can the spirit of the modern septic rest.

"Indeed, when you look longer at it, you begin to doubt whether there is any repose at all. . . . Perched on the extreme point of this abrupt rock, the Church Militant with its aspirant archangel stands high above the world, and seems to threaten heaven itself. . . . Here we do not

feel the Trinity at all; the Virgin but little; Christ hardly more; we feel only the Archangel and the Unity of God. We have little logic here, and simple faith, but we have energy."

This masculine art represents a period which finds another expression in the *chansons de geste*. In the most famous of these, *The Song of Roland*, woman and her influence are banished. Although it is permeated by the spirit of Catholic Christianity, it is the Christianity of St. Michael and the Father, not of Mary or of the Son. In the prayer of Roland just before his death "God the Father, as feudal seigneur, absorbs the Trinity, and, what is more significant, absorbs or excludes also the Virgin, who is not mentioned in the prayer." In both poem and cathedral it is the Church Militant that is represented.

*The Song of Roland* and Mont-Saint-Michel were both of the eleventh century, although the church was not completed until a later time, and the eleventh century belongs to St. Michael and God the Father. The twelfth century belongs to the Virgin and is a transition to the thirteenth century, which belongs to the Trinity. The change from Mont-Saint-Michel to Chartres, from eleventh to twelfth century, from St. Michael to the Virgin, is a change from masculine militancy to feminine mercy and perhaps feminine caprice. No one who reads the book can doubt that Henry Adams makes the change with joy.

But in the change from masculine to feminine there is no diminution of power. As already suggested, Adams recognizes first of all Mary's strength—feels it as well as sees its consequences. The following sentences about the Chartres Cathedral speak the loyal emotion of Henry Adams:

"Three great windows on the Virgin's right, balanced by three more on her left, show the prophets and precursors of her son; all architecturally support and exalt the Virgin, in her celestial atmosphere of blue, shot with red, calm in the certainty of heaven. Any one who is prematurely curious to see the difference in treatment in different centuries should go down to the church of Saint Pierre in the lower town, and study there the methods of the Renaissance. Then we can come back to study again the ways of the thirteenth century. The Virgin will wait; she will not be angry; she knows her power; we all come back to her in the end."

And we feel that he shares the confidence of the French who invested their money in the Queen of Heaven. He tells us that "according to statistics, in the single century between 1170 and 1270, the French built eighty cathedrals and nearly five hundred churches of the cathedral class, which would have cost, according to an estimate made in 1840, more than five thousand millions to replace. . . . Just as the French of the nineteenth century invested their surplus of capital in a railway system in the belief that they would make money by it in this life, in the thirteenth they trusted their money to the Queen of Heaven because of their belief in her power to repay it with interest in the life to come."

But her power is something more than the confidence she inspires in her ability to reward one in this world or in the world to come. It is a spiritual and mystical power. Of the ceremonies in honor of the Virgin in her church, Adams writes:

"Many a young person, and now and then one not in first youth, witnessing the sight, in the religious atmosphere of such a church as this, without a suspicion of susceptibility, has suddenly seen what Paul saw on the road to Damascus, and has fallen on his face with the crowd, grovelling at the foot of the cross, which, for the first time in his life, he feels."

If Henry Adams found power in the woman of the Middle Ages, and in the worship of woman as represented by Mary, he also found relief from law, from the restraints of a mechanical universe, and from the stern commands of a Puritan deity. It was not so much the power of Mary that won him as it was her rebellion against order, convention, and fate. God the Father and even Christ the Son were comparatively unbending and law-abiding. Mary defied law, convention, even the will of the Father himself.

"Mary concentrated in herself the whole rebellion of man against fate; the whole protest against the divine law; the whole contempt for human law as its outcome; the whole unutterable fury of human nature beating itself against the walls of its prison-house, and suddenly seized by a hope that in the Virgin man had found a door of escape. . . . She knew that the universe was as unintelligible to her, on any theory of morals, as it was to her worshippers, and she felt, like them, no sure

conviction that it was any more intelligible to the creator of it. To her every suppliant was a world in itself, to be judged apart, on its own merits, by his love for her."

Surely, this is Henry Adams speaking for himself. And closely connected with this lawlessness of Mary was her mercy, for mercy meant the defiance of law. And this mercy and lawlessness separated her from the correct and the conventionally pious. "In no well-regulated community," we are told, "under a proper system of police, could the Virgin feel at home, and the same thing may be said of most other saints as well as sinners."

If Henry Adams was fascinated by the power of Mary, and by her lawlessness and mercy, he was also attracted by her mystery. Lover of science, he was charmed by woman because no science could interpret her. "The proper study of mankind is woman," he says, "and by common agreement since the time of Adam, it is the most complex and arduous. The study of Our Lady, as shown by the art of Chartres, leads directly back to Eve, and lays bare the whole subject of sex."

The decline in the position of the Virgin and of woman Henry Adams regretted. This decline began in the Middle Ages, and its progress is recorded in the second part of the *Romance of the Rose*, in which satire takes the place of worship. He cannot forgive the Catholic Church for permitting the Virgin to be less than she once was. And Brooks Adams tells us that Henry "found the 'Reformation' most antagonistic, chiefly . . . because of the Puritan attack on women, for it was during the Reformation that the Virgin was dethroned and, according to his theory, I take it, that the degradation of woman began."<sup>5</sup> Henry Adams also speaks contemptuously of America's failure to recognize woman for what she is. Just what that means, every one must decide for himself.

Henry Adams, mediaevalist, is a worshipper of woman. It has been suggested that he went to the Middle Ages for her in order that he might escape the reality of the present. Mr. Gamaliel Bradford guessed that "he was entranced with the Middle Ages—precisely because of their unreality to a man of modern spirit." Probably Mr. Bradford was right. Does the

<sup>5</sup> *The Degradation of Democratic Dogma*, p. 111.

experienced man expect to find the dream woman among the realities? And yet it should not be forgotten that Adams honored women among his contemporaries too. Moreover, one must not forget the shrine in the Rock Creek Cemetery, Washington, in which is the draped bronze figure of a woman, the work of Saint Gaudens done at the suggestion of Henry Adams and placed in honor of the dead wife who is there buried. It is apparently a woman of the East, a symbol of Nirvana perhaps, though we are told that those nearest to Henry Adams probably did not know what it was intended to symbolize. Of it John Hay said: "It is full of poetry and suggestion; infinite wisdom; a past without beginning; a future without end; a repose after limitless experience; a peace to which nothing matters—all are embodied in this austere and beautiful face and form." Is it not significant that the peace which the restless mind of Henry Adams craved should be represented by a woman?

Did Henry Adams reach the goal of his romantic quest? His niece, Mrs. LaFarge, would have us believe that he did, and that he found it in the acceptance of the Son of Mary. After his death there was found in a wallet containing special papers verses to the Virgin of Chartres of which Mrs. LaFarge says:

"One can understand that he did not care to publish them during his lifetime, for he never wished to lift the veil. In this 'Prayer' Henry Adams makes an act of faith in the Son's divinity. He ends by saying in his own words what Saint John said twenty centuries before: 'In him was life; and the life was the light of men. And the light shineth in darkness, and the darkness comprehended it not.' Henry Adams felt the failure of the world to receive the light, but he leaves no shadow of doubt that he himself perceived 'That was the true Light'."<sup>8</sup>

Well as Mrs. LaFarge knew her uncle, she surely did not know his mind in this. His homage was of the heart, an acknowledgment of the beauty of the Christian conception; it was not a yielding of the intellect. In the poem itself, he speaks not as the Henry Adams of the twentieth century, but as a representative of men in many centuries, including no

<sup>8</sup> *Letters to a Niece*, p. 27.



doubt those countless ancestors whose numbers he whimsically estimates as being, arithmetically, many millions. The poem has beauty and pathos because Henry Adams did *not* believe.

Mr. Paul Elmer More suggests that the irresponsibility of the Virgin gave to the "tired sceptic the illusion of having reached a comfortable goal after his long voyage of education." "There is a fateful analogy," he adds, "between the irresponsibility of unreasoning Force and unreasoning love; and the gods of Nietzsche and of Tolstoy are but the two faces of one god." The end of Adams's career Mr. More describe as "sentimental nihilism."<sup>7</sup>

I have no objection to the term "sentimental nihilism" used, as I should use it, without contempt. But I am inclined to believe that Mr. More is wrong in identifying the unreasoning force of science with the unreasoning love of the Virgin. I should say that modern scientific determinism had much to do with the emotional and intellectual unrest that drove Henry Adams into the arms of the Virgin. He went to Mary to escape Nietzsche. In accepting modern science, he had rejected the Puritan faith of his ancestors. He found in the emotional acceptance of the Mother of Jesus, and in his pilgrimage through the centuries over which she reigned, a compensation, genuine if inadequate, for a lost religion.

---

<sup>7</sup> *A New England Group and Others*, pp. 139, 140.

## Book Reviews

SAMUEL ADAMS. By Ralph Volney Harlow. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1923. pp. X, 363.

Mr. Harlow has our thanks for this book. It clarifies and increases our knowledge. To it one can send, with just a word of warning, students and those friends who like their history uncensored.

Politics is the author's primary interest. He deals with "the processes of the Revolution, with informal committees and extra-legal assemblages, with the manufacture of public opinion; in short, with the complicated, underground machinery necessary to all revolutions." This is work worth doing. For our historical writers have too much ignored the humble mechanics of movements, the processes by which men's minds are made up for them and their energies directed for them. Consequently students come to believe that in history "causes" produce "effects" spontaneously, which, of course, makes history both unreal and untrue, and is bad training in citizenship, besides. And the work has been done well. The author's method is almost unique. It consists, essentially, in applying to familiar sources the rules of interpretation that one applies to the record of a contemporary person. Such a method dispels glamor, which is a sad thing to do. But it shows the "Promoter of the American Revolution" as he worked, which it was the author's business to do. Moreover, it gives us a very useful body of facts for the period from 1764 to 1789. One may offer many criticisms, such as a lack of background in places, exaggeration of Adams's part, manifest dislike of revolutionists in general and Adams in particular, and dogmatic assertion where the evidence adduced justifies only a statement of inference. But, for all this, one must remain thankful for the scholarly marshalling of facts and the common sense in the interpretation of them.

The book is also, professedly, a study in psychology. "It is concerned with 'the secret places of the heart' of the revolutionary personality." The diagnosis is as follows: At forty-three Adams had accomplished nothing and seemed interested

in nothing but politics. His failures had created in him an "inferiority complex." "This operates powerfully in a perfectly normal individual; in the case of a neurotic it seems to release even greater energy." Now, since nearly three hundred and fifty pages are required to chronicle the amazing activity of Adams, we should certainly expect to find that he was a neurotic of the first order. Instead, however, we learn: "Now Adams was not entirely normal, and he probably was a neurotic; in any case he was nervously unstable!" Worse still, the only evidence of nervousness adduced is "a tremulousness of voice and hand," which characterized other members of his family without making them revolutionists and which does not seem to have manifested itself in Samuel until eleven years after the beginning of his revolutionary activities. Moreover, the reader is not convinced that there was any connection between Adams's early failure and his later activity. Otis, who worked with him, does not appear to have made a conspicuous failure in life; and certainly Patrick Henry and Thomas Jefferson were not failures at any time. Martin Luther, with whom the author frequently compares Adams, was doing well before he started the Protestant Revolt. And who would charge with "an inferiority complex" those numerous gentlemen of all generations since the Revolution with whom, as with Adams, habitual dislike of Great Britain was either an obsession or a stock in trade?—Frankly, I am sorry that someone advised Mr. Harlow thus to mar his otherwise interesting and helpful study.

Wake Forest, N. C.

C. C. PEARSON.

JOHN ESTEN COOKE, VIRGINIAN. By John O. Beaty, Ph.D. New York: Columbia University Press, 1922. 173 pp.

THOMAS NELSON PAGE, A MEMOIR OF A VIRGINIA GENTLEMAN. By Rosewell Page. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1923. 210 pp.

The reader of Dr. Beaty's critical biography of John Esten Cooke must feel that the author's sustaining maxim throughout his task was that what is not worth doing at all is worth doing well. Unfortunately this seems the inevitable principle

254957A

underlying the work of many doctoral dissertations. In this instance, there is an attempt to justify the choice of subject on the ground that Cooke was "perhaps second to Poe" among "Virginia writers whose careers have come to a close." But Dr. Beaty's critical honesty leads him in his concluding estimate to record so many of Cooke's stylistic blemishes and offences against artistic truth, that he tacitly admits that this second position is far from being a close one.

As a biography the work is full and accurate. Moreover, it is interesting. It is a picture of a hack writer who made a comfortable success of his work. Critically it is sound. The author yields to no temptation to minimize faults or to magnify merits,—a tendency characteristic of many works of this nature.

Cooke's best work, *The Virginia Comedians*, it must be admitted, has its place in our literature, and Dr. Beaty makes the most of it. For it he has a right to claim permanency, but he does not explain why Cooke refused to write more books of this quality. The novelist himself could not explain it. Since he preferred a renown for melodramatic plots and flamboyant style he deserves the obscurity into which he has fallen; and he does not deserve, perhaps would not have desired, the prominence and permanence seemingly accorded him in so painstaking a study as Dr. Beaty has made.

Rosewell Page's little book about his brother, Thomas Nelson Page, professes to be no more than a memoir. Obviously it ought not to be judged by standards set for a more pretentious type of work. Yet its plan is that of a biography, and had the author seen fit to add to his material, chapter by chapter, he might have achieved a full and well-rounded portrayal that would have satisfied all lovers of the Virginia novelist.

From the scenes of Page's boyhood and youth he has built up a vivid background, and he has given an adequate picture of the ante-bellum plantation life, the young man's war experiences, and his college days. Intimate glimpses are shown of characters, places, and incidents that supplied material for the later stories and novels. The delineation of Page as a boy among the other boys helps to fill in the outline of *Two Little Confederates*, just as the picture of his young manhood serves as a commentary on the *Old Virginia* tales.

But all this fills fully half of the memoir. The treatment of his major activities is far too meagre to be satisfying. His experiences in Washington, his service in Rome, his home life at Oakland are but sketchily treated. The chapter devoted to his friendships is only five pages long, and that on his lecture tours is less than two. Occasionally a few lines from his correspondence are quoted. But the lover of Page would have welcomed the inclusion of complete letters and more of them.

Evidently this work is not the definitive biography. Possibly a companion volume of letters is to be issued. In any event, Rosewell Page has succeeded in showing us just enough of his famous brother's delightful personality and interesting life to make us want more.

SANFORD SALYER.

BERNARD BOSANQUET. *A SHORT ACCOUNT OF HIS LIFE.* By Helen Bosanquet. London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1924. 152 pp.

In this biography of her husband Mrs. Bosanquet tells of a "tall and handsome Chinese philosopher, who wrote to a mutual friend that on returning home from an afternoon at Oxshott he had cancelled a dinner engagement and shut himself up in his rooms to preserve as long as possible the mood induced by his talk with Bernard." The same desire for continuance of mood is created by this book itself; it takes one beyond cleverness to sincerity, and beyond intellectual solemnity to a fresh and humane wisdom. Mrs. Bosanquet has put in her debt not only the large number of people who care to know about the man because of his writings—and his writings are indispensable to students of logic, metaphysics, æsthetics, or political and social philosophy—but to all who are sensitive to the outline and detail of a beautiful life. The outline is, on the whole, the normal one for an English scholar and gentleman, although Bosanquet was an outstanding example of his type—according to T. H. Green, "the best equipped man of his generation." Born by the sea in the north country, of good Huguenot and Scottish stock, member of a singularly united, vigorous, and sensible household, educated at Harrow and Oxford, and having sufficient means to allow him to choose the

work he loved, he was throughout favored by fortune. He taught for short periods at Oxford and St. Andrews, but aside from that devoted himself to his well-known scholarly writings and to practical activity for the Charity Organization Society, the London School of Sociology, which was in a sense the forerunner of the present London School of Economics, and to examining for the Indian Civil Service.

It is interesting to know this general scheme of the externals of Bosanquet's life. But we are more particularly in debt to Mrs. Bosanquet for the fragments of her story by which she reveals his attitude on popular questions and the specific quality of his temper. In politics he was an advanced Liberal, sympathetic with the aspirations of Labor, favoring Irish Home Rule, opposed to the Boer War, and in the recent war, assigning the cause not to "the State, nor sovereignty, nor merely the Germans nor the Kaiser . . . but to all of us, pursuing our mingled aims, which take no account of others." He was a great believer in the part that women would play in the world when their capacities were fully recognized and developed. One could have told this *a priori* from the type of woman he chose for his wife. The unconventional sensitiveness of his conscience is illustrated by the account of how he disposed of superfluous books. "He consistently refused to give away any that he considered second-rate as it would be spreading inferior or even wrong ideas . . . We were more than once reduced to burying large numbers in the garden." In works of imagination his favorites were the *Odyssey* and the *Divine Comedy*, but he had a catholic taste in fiction and he usually kept his critical faculty in abeyance while reading for recreation. His interest in æsthetics was not merely academic. He made his house beautiful for his own and his friends' enjoyment with a few fine pictures, Morris wall papers and hangings, and de Morgan tiles, and he never condemned any new movement in art because its products were not instantaneously pleasing. In the tales of most men's lives, what happens at the funeral is of small moment. But it seems somehow to set off the impressive and triumphant character of Bosanquet's career that

when he was laid to rest the organist should have played the Hallelujah Chorus as a "tribute of praise and gratitude for the great gift of his life."

KATHERINE GILBERT.

THE KING'S JOURNALIST, 1659-1689: STUDIES IN THE REIGN OF CHARLES II. By J. G. Muddiman. London: John Lane, 1923, pp. 294.

THE PERIODICAL ESSAYISTS OF THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY WITH ILLUSTRATIVE EXTRACTS FROM THE RARER PERIODICALS. By George S. Marr. New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1924, pp. 264.

In recent years, with the narrowing of fields for research in history and literature, we have seen a growing recognition of the value of the newspaper and the periodical as source material. The rich deposits of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, in particular, are now being mined, and it appears that their wealth was by no means exhausted by the earlier workers. Of course, every now and then an incompetent scholar will mistake fool's gold for the genuine article; by and large, however, an intelligent worker in this field is sure to strike pay dirt.

Mr. Muddiman's book will be welcomed by every student of the period of Charles II. More accurately described from its sub-title, the book adds considerable information about journalists and journalism from 1659 to 1689. The part which the newsbooks played in bringing about the Restoration has never been so clearly shown. Henry Muddiman's relations with General Monck, his appointment as official journalist, and his work for Charles II receive due attention. The developments leading to the publication of the *Gazette* in 1665 are given in copious detail. Other material of value deals with the history of the post office, with the Popish Plot, and with some interesting individuals like Sir Roger L'Estrange and Benjamin Harris, who was the first American journalist.

But the chief value of the book is in the information it gives concerning that little-known form, the news-letter. The news-letter was written, not printed, and was circulated to subscribers by means of the post. Henry Muddiman had been publisher of the official newsbook from 1660 until 1663, and had developed a sense for news values which evidently pleased

his readers. At what time he began to circulate his news-letters it is not clear, but the suspicion arose that he sometimes kept items out of the printed newsbooks in order to make his news-letters of more value and interest. When he had to give way to L'Estrange as publisher of the newsbooks, he seems to have had already a large correspondence. From 1663 on, he devoted himself entirely to his news-letters, getting these out with the assistance of copyists, and being careful to keep an official copy for his own record.

The facts about the circulation and the financial reward of the news-letters are well brought out. Each of Muddiman's several hundred subscribers paid him not less than £5 a year. Although Muddiman's income was not all clear gain, as his copyists had to be paid, to offset this he had, as King's Journalist, the privilege of franking his news-letters. The jealousies caused by his monopoly make interesting reading, especially the attempt of Hickes to steal his subscription list.

Manuscripts of the whole of Henry Muddiman's news-letters from 1667 to 1689 were placed at the author's disposal. The existence of these journals had not hitherto been known. Scant use has been made of them in this book, however, and one hopes that the author is planning to publish them entire. They would be a most welcome addition to our knowledge of the period, especially for the reign of James II, as the State Papers are most inadequate for those years.

In a book like this, every page of which is a testimony to the author's painstaking research, it may seem indeed gratuitous to pick flaws. One cannot help wishing, however, that the author's royalist leanings had been disguised a little more completely. Also, one wonders why no reference has been made to the various studies of Mr. J. B. Williams, which cover much of the same territory, a fact doubtless due to extreme modesty, as enlightened men know that Mr. Williams and Mr. Muddiman are identical. It is surprising to read (p. 234) that "L'Estrange's life has yet to be written," since Mr. George Kitchin's well documented and minute work on Sir Roger L'Estrange, which appeared in 1913, would seem to leave little for another biographer to do.



Mr. Marr's book attempts, in the words of the preface, "to give an approximately complete and detailed survey of the periodical essay of the eighteenth century and its writers." An adequate work on the eighteenth century periodicals is indeed much to be wished for. The field is very large, so large that one is in danger of losing his way, unless his road be well marked by some preliminary definition. Other investigators in this territory have avoided by-paths and pitfalls even at the expense of grace. Mr. Ames, for example, had to use a cumbersome title for his work, *The English Literary Periodical of Morals and Manners*, but it is the better for the definiteness of the limits indicated. Mr. Marr makes no limits, and apparently sees no need of any restrictions. His task, therefore, is hopeless from the start. The claim of "completeness" has been made before by eighteenth century investigators, generally to their embarrassment. It is indeed time that the eighteenth century scholar should admit the virtual impossibility, in a period for which we have such a vast bulk of material, of ever doing a "complete" job.

In the lack of any formal statement of what the writer is going to include as periodical essays, one turns for light to the list of those actually used, only to be continually asking why one was included, and not others. If the *Monthly Miscellany*, 1707, is included, why not the more valuable *Muses Mercury* of the same year? If some newspapers (as the *Daily Courant*), why not the rest? Theobald's *Censor* appears, but not Brereton's *Critick*, nor Blackmore's *The Lay Monk*. If *Terrae-Filius*, why not the *Visions of Sir Heister Riley*? Mr. Marr cites the *New Memoirs of Literature*, 1722, and writes about it as if this were an isolated occurrence of an unusual type. It is hard to understand how his investigations could have missed the earlier work by the same author, and the *Works of the Learned*, and the other journals of books which make an almost continuous performance after 1682. The *Critical Review* comes in for a word in its proper time order (1756) but one looks in vain for any mention of the *Monthly Review*, which was of similar scope, equal importance, and prior date. In short, Mr. Marr's list is by not means complete on any grounds; it does not even include all the *Tatler* and *Spectator* imitations.

As Mr. Marr's work is confessedly popular, there has been no attempt to cite any authorities, and it would seem that he is familiar with no investigations later than the work of Dr. Nathan Drake. From the first page on, error follows error. Not only is Mr. Marr wrong in dates, but frequently in his descriptions of the journals he writes about. The *Gentleman's Journal* is most grievously mishandled (p. 191), for example, and even the date of *Robinson Crusoe* is incorrect (p. 65). Such mistakes are scarcely pardonable in the case of an investigator who has had access to private collections, as well as to the British Museum, the Bodleian, and the Advocates's Library.

Along with these irritating and needless errors of fact, one discovers a fondness for critical platitudes. We are informed that Longinus "is one of the most significant figures in the history of criticism" (p. 139), that "The critic of literature will always give a high place to the work of Addison and Steele" (p. 63) and that *Tom Jones* is "perhaps the greatest single novel we possess" (p. 36).

The bulk of the work deals with the better known periodicals, such as the *Tatler* and *Spectator*, the *Rambler* and *Idler*, the *World*, the *Connoisseur*, the *Adventurer*, the *Looker-on*,—in short, those already dignified by reprints in the British Essayists. The Edinburgh periodicals cited by Mr. Marr had already been made known by Mr. W. J. Couper. The *Censor* is represented by a 2-page quotation, the *Plain Dealer* by three pages, the *Champion* by one. In short, the rarer periodicals remain, for all practical purposes, just as far out of reach as ever.

While the book will prove disappointing to many, possibly because of the publishers' overstatement, yet there is some good in it. Scholarship, to be sure, there is not. But the final chapter, in which certain causes for the changes in the periodical are given, will prove stimulating, although the evidence is but meagerly presented. Also, the book should serve to create more interest in an important form of eighteenth century writing, and suggest lines of investigation which may yield solid results.

E. P. McCUTCHEON.

Wake Forest College.

DISCOURSES ON DANTE. By Charles H. Grandgent. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1924. viii, 201 pp.

This addition to the list of excellent books that has made the author the best-known of American Dantists is composed chiefly of essays already printed in periodicals and tending to be popular in character.

The work opens with a *sestina* on the value of Dante to the present age. Notable lines are

Ere peace prevail on any mortal shore  
(So taught the Tuscan poet long ago),  
Justice must reign: in it alone is peace.

The second discourse, "Dante Six Hundred Years After," presents the poet as a champion of eternal justice, God's will. Armed with this conception of justice, his faith survives all assaults, and he is able to say: "In his will is our peace." It is fitting that justice is the theme of the first essay, for Dante spoke truly when he referred to himself as one "preaching justice."

From the next chapter, "Dante and Italy," I quote a passage on the choice of Dante's language as the language of Italy: "In most countries . . . the elevation of one particular dialect into a national language has been due to political causes. Generally the choice has been determined by the seat of power, the residence of the king and his court. It is characteristic of Italy that her preference has been dictated, not by politics, but by art. No temporal authority, but the eternal authority of beauty created the Italian language and imposed it upon the whole Italian people, long before there was an Italian nation."

The discourse on "The Centre of the Circle" explains the artistic harmony of the poem. Incidentally the author remarks of Dante: "Nowhere does he call his journey a vision or a dream." Yet *Paradiso* 32.139 is commonly interpreted as referring to the poem as a dream; indeed it is so explained in Professor Grandgent's own edition of the *Comedy* (published in 1913). Some authorities give the same interpretation to *Paradiso* 17.128.

The discourse entitled "All Men Desire to Know" shows Dante in the presence of some of the mysteries of life, such as "why one spirit should be more gifted than another," one of the problems of the *Paradiso*. The discourse concludes by assigning to Dante the belief that "in the predestined scheme of the universe there is a fit place for every one of God's creatures. Every one of us has his own mansion assigned him. Though despite all his endeavor he find it not on earth, he will find it among the many in his Father's house." The Platonic belief that every man has his worthy place in the world is of importance in Dante, but it seems unlikely that he expected to compensate for the imperfection of this world by another world set over against this. As the late Bernard Bosanquet remarked: "For Dante too, heaven and hell lay ultimately in character." There is no reason to suppose that Dante intended the *Paradiso* to be less allegorical—less directly applicable to the life of man on earth—than the other parts of the *Comedy*; yet students do not commonly grapple with its allegory, but permit paradise to stand as a literal other-world over against ours, even though Dante's chief exposition of his allegorical intention (the latter to Can Grande) was written to accompany his last cantica.

The section on "The Choice of a Theme" presents Dante growing toward the *Divine Comedy* as an inevitable subject. At the end of the chapter, the *Confessions* of St. Augustine appear as one of Dante's models. In addition there might have been mentioned some works of a more evidently objective spiritual character, such as the Book of Ezekiel, in order to include the aspect of Dante's work evident in the remarks on justice in the second discourse. In much recent comment, as that of Flamini, there is a tendency to emphasize personal at the expense of general elements.

The discourse on Dante's verse is the most technical but not the least interesting. In referring to Dante's meeting with Homer and the other great poets, the author says that in modesty Dante "assigns himself the sixth and last place, whereas posterity has generally awarded him the first." The reviewer sympathizes with this estimate, though he has some doubt about its general acceptance by posterity. And is it

necessary to interpret the passage as placing Dante sixth in rank, rather than as assigning him to the group without further classification?

Considering Dante's astronomical knowledge, one may perhaps properly remark on the thoughtful concluding sonnet that the boundlessness of the universe ("a boundless maze") is not now an article of faith with astronomers. The theme of the sonnet is that art does not develop like science:

Do beauty, honor, dignity progress?

Since the book is on the whole intended for readers not familiar with Dante, it may properly be tested by asking: Will it gain him new readers? Will it assist rereading? If all popular critical works were submitted to this test, many of them, seemingly intended as substitutes for the works they deal with, would not survive. Professor Grandgent's work passes the test, however, for he remains close to his author, and, as it were, assumes that the complete text is at hand. Moreover, he gives such full and admirable quotations, often from his own translations, that no reader can wholly escape the words of the poet himself.

ALLAN H. GILBERT.

CONSCRIPTION AND CONFLICT IN THE CONFEDERACY. By Albert Burton Moore. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1924, pp. ix, 367.

Mr. Moore's work has a double value; first, as a contribution to the history of the Confederacy, and second as it throws light on that larger question of how a free people respond to the obligation to military duty in time of war.

Regarding the Confederacy the scope of the discussion is very broad. The reasons for conscription and the repercussion it aroused among the people, the interpretations of the courts, the conflicts between Confederate and state executives, and the attitudes of politicians are dealt with, as well as questions of administration and their results. Everywhere there were "friction, confusion, and dereliction." The popular clamor of "a rich man's war and a poor man's fight" was well justified by the early exemption laws, and some of the loudest in denunciation of the Yankees were "exempts." In administration

there was not only conflict between Confederate and state authorities, but also between various organs of the Confederacy itself. Yet the practical results were important; conscription alone enabled the Confederacy to keep its armies from dwindling during the summer of 1862 and it was the basis of the wonderful fighting units of 1863 and 1864. The actual numbers it furnished may never be known. Mr. Moore thinks that probably one-third of the soldiers of the Confederacy were conscripts and that another third volunteered to prevent being conscripted. In the last analysis conscription failed only when the Confederacy itself failed.

Light on the question of the attitude of a free people toward military service is given by implication and suggested analogies. The wild enthusiasm of 1861 was quickly followed by apathy, and to save the cause compulsory service was necessary. But how could compulsion be reconciled with the spirit of democracy? How could a proper principle of exemption be found and established? These questions were not solved by the Confederacy, and it remained for the United States in the recent World War, through the slogan of selective service, to make a far more satisfactory solution. Under that slogan sacrifices were more equally distributed; under the Confederacy they were more heroic. But whether, under one system or the other, the strain could be borne for more than four years is doubtful.

W. K. B.

GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS OF BELGIUM. By Thomas Harrison Reed. New York: World Book Company, 1924, pp. xiii, 197.

This most recent volume of the Government Handbook Series provides a brief and very interesting description of Belgium's governmental organization, its political functioning and party system. But it is more than that. Written after a first-hand study of conditions and discussion with many Belgians of all parties and walks of life, this little book is marked by its reality. The reader is bound to see the government not as a mere mechanism but as a real living institution—a vehicle of

the nation's life. The result is an extremely readable book that is scholarly but scarcely complete. It is a textbook of the newer type.

In variety of devices for the realization of democratic self-government, Belgium compares favorably with Switzerland. Here there has been no evidence of hesitancy in experimentation. Of chief interest to Americans, perhaps, are the agencies of proportional representation and compulsory voting. The d'Hondt system of proportional representation has been in use since 1898—a period sufficiently long to justify a careful study of its actual achievements. Professor Reed's conclusions are interesting but scarcely satisfying: "In estimating the results of proportional representation," the author declares, "first place should be given to the fact that the Belgians are satisfied with it. Since its introduction there has been a marked assuagement of the bitterness of party struggles, which is in part due to the proportional system. There can be in Belgium no such thing as the 'land slides' which characterize American politics. A ten per cent victory in the country can no longer translate itself into a sixty-six per cent victory in the chamber." pp. 52, 53.

Professor Reed's consideration of compulsory voting is even less satisfactory. Introduced in 1893, there should be results exceedingly interesting and decidedly worth while. The reader is hardly satisfied with two scant pages and the conclusion that "compulsory voting must be counted a success in Belgium." Before 1893 about thirty-five per cent of the qualified voters failed to exercise their right of suffrage. The imposition of a penalty for failure to vote, although very slight, immediately reduced the number to six per cent. But in many instances, the author tells us, the blank ballots cast are considerable. Would one be justified in considering this as a silent protests against the compulsory system? Mr. Reed does not say.

In fairness to the author it should be said that there is no pretense of making an "exhaustive treatment of Belgian public law nor to rehearse in detail her political history." Rather his purpose is "to state briefly, and with such accuracy as a stranger may hope to achieve, the essential features of her

governmental organization and party system." (p. XI). This the author does very well. Since the book is admittedly an introduction to the subject, there should certainly be a "selected bibliography," to say nothing of a "critical bibliography." Both these are desirable features of the earlier volumes of the Government Handbook Series. Although copious footnotes compensate in a measure for this omission, it is to be hoped that the standard of excellence set in the former volumes will be followed in the remaining studies, already announced.

For students of Politics, Professor Reed has performed a valuable service. This is the only study of the government and politics of Belgium available in English, and should be gladly received by American students.

ALPHEUS T. MASON.

SCHOLARSHIP AND OTHER ESSAYS. By Calvin Thomas. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1924. viii, + 217 pp.

These lectures, or essays, if you prefer, are frankly of the academic-popular variety. They have the scholar's amiable condescension; their gaiety is rather formal; their learning is unashamed. And one likes them the better on this account. Professor Thomas' stylistic and attitudinous defects add, if you will, a real *je-ne-sais-quoi*-ish charm. With the frontispiece portrait they reveal the professor O. S. and *par excellence*, a delightful fellow to know—and now, alack! fading into history, while the new professor comes forward, young and a man of the world, a low-salaried salesman of the great Educational Trust. Your old professor, I say, is passing, and the judicious can but regret: a being apart, not too human, a kind of stage character, a humour, somewhat separated from the commoner frailties by his great wall of heaped-up and unusable knowledge, yet with weaknesses enough of his own, those touches which let the soul come through.

The lectures here collected cover a great variety of topics, from "Schiller's Realism" and "Observations upon Poetry" to some "frivolous remarks" on the much editing of modern language texts; all headed by a sonnet to Virgil, and closed



with a solemn requiem on the Choir Invisible. And there is an appreciative sketch of Professor Thomas' life and work by W. A. Braun.

The paper which will probably give the greatest simple satisfaction to general readers is that entitled "The Devil." It often happens that he whom we meet daily in the well-worn routine we really know least. We recognize him, if we are wise, when we see him, but we are vague about his antecedents and his family relations. This being, who began, in our religious antiquity, merely as one of the agents of Jehovah, became through Babylonish connections the spirit of evil; but the transition was not sudden, and to the writers of the New Testament he was an uncertain character. For a long time he led a sort of double life, his two natures typified in the Lucifer-Satan of Milton and in the Mephisto of Goethe. Milton's hero, however, has now for some time been extinct, but the other continues flourishingly. Along his way he attracted to himself various attributes, a lame leg, a cloven hoof, a goatish sensuality, a sulphuric atmosphere, and, for practical purposes, a gentlemanly bearing. All which Professor Thomas relates pleasantly enough.

But this essay ends rather abruptly, and one should continue by reading the lecture on "Science and Religion in Goethe's Faust," which is the most successful in the collection. The summary of Part II—and it is extremely well done—will be welcome to most readers; and the sympathetic interpretation of the Goethean philosophy, which no one could be more competent than Professor Thomas to undertake, ought to be very welcome to our harassed generation. PAULL F. BAUM.

AUTHORS OF THE DAY. By Grant Overton. New York: George H. Doran Company, 1924. 390 pp.

This book of Mr. Overton's is a selection of the best portions of two earlier volumes (now out of print) which were issued, as the phrase runs, in the interest of distribution. To put it crudely, they were a species of advertisements, but this is, also, to put it somewhat unfairly. Everyone knows that the greater part of reviewing nowadays is a species of advertisement; yet, in sober truth, when was it otherwise, except in the

old days of the early quarterlies, when a review was simply an independent essay on the subject of another man's book? If "advertising" is done with the ability and finesse of "American Nights Entertainment" and "When Winter Comes to Main Street," albeit the titles are a bit flashy, no one need complain, and no one will.

Mr. Overton is a diligent observer of the auctorial scene. He brings to his task a proper lightness and zest, reasonable care and accuracy, and withal a modicum of discrimination. If with the accepted worthies—Conrad, Galsworthy, Arnold Bennett, Booth Tarkington, and half a dozen more of less secure standing—we find also certain people of unimportance—whom I need not name—still we must remember that contemporary literature always includes the evanescent along with the permanent, and the picture would be as "wrong" if it omitted many scribblers of low degree as it would be if it made the vain pretence of portraying only the permanent. No picture has highlights only, and it is simply true that Mr. Robert W. Chambers, Mr. Harold Bell Wright, and the late Mrs. Gene Stratton-Porter are phenomena in current literature, though they will probably not occupy very much of our descendants' attention. For each of these Authors of the Day—malice might alter to Authors of a Day—Mr. Overton gives a few biographical and bibliographical data, and he generally makes an interesting point about each one. Though nobody will misunderstand his purpose, every one interested in contemporary writing will find something of interest and of value in his selection.

PAULL F. BAUM.

## Royall & Borden

We have practically furnished every building on Trinity campus and most of the faculty homes. We sell all kinds of furniture and are agents for Columbia Grafonolas and records. Ask the treasurer of Trinity College about us.

## Royall & Borden

CORNER WEST MAIN AND MARKET STREETS  
DURHAM, N. C.

